



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.
BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO
THE LIBRARY OF
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division

Section

500
10066

12

75



ANNALS

OF THE

“LOW-CHURCH” PARTY

IN ENGLAND,

DOWN TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP TAIT.

BY THE ✓

REV. W. H. B. PROBY, M.A.,

AUTHOR OF “LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN RELIGION,” “AN EXPLANATION OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN,” ETC.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

Πόλλ' ἀπιστία δεδρακεν ἀγαθὰ [καὶ] πίστις κακὰ.

CLEM. ALEX., *Strom.* IV. iii., *imit.*

LONDON:

J. T. HAYES,

17, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1888.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

- CHAPTER XXXVIII.—Polemical Period, continued. The Gorham Case.
- CHAPTER XXXIX.—Polemical Period, continued. Papal Aggression. "Durham Letter." Dr. M'Neile on Confession and Absolution. Revival of Convocation. Exeter Synod. Episcopal Pastoral on Ritual. Division of Services. Evening Communion. Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome.
- CHAPTER XL.—Polemical Period, continued. Miss Sellon and her Sisterhood attacked by the Rev. J. Spurrell. Prayer-book Revision Society. Low-Church Plot for Religious Comprehension in Australia.
- CHAPTER XLI.—Polemical Period, continued. Low-Church Opposition to the Sacramental System. Suit brought by Westerton. Sabbatarianism. Rev. H. Alford and the *Record*. Bishop Gobat and Schismatics in Scotland. Rev. Henry Cotterill appointed to the See of Grahamstown. Opening of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.
- CHAPTER XLII.—Prosecution of Archdeacon Denison. New Society for maintaining Low-Church Principles. Riotous Conduct at a Sister's Funeral. Privy Council Judgment about the Knightsbridge Churches.
- CHAPTER XLIII.—Polemical Period, continued. Movement for extra Preaching. Opening of Exeter Hall on Sunday Evenings. Opening of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey for Evening Services and Sermons. Special Services Aid Society. "Church Missionary Society" helps to increase the Episcopate. Fraternising with Dissent. Dean Alford and the "Evangelical Alliance" at Berlin. Turkish Missions Aid Society.

- CHAPTER XLIV.—Polemical Period, continued. Rev. A. Poole turned out of his Curacy for hearing Confessions, &c. Complaints against the Rev. R. T. West. Disregard of Truth. Promotions of Low-Churchmen by Lord Palmerston.
- CHAPTER XLV.—Polemical Period, continued. Emotional “Revival.” Lavington Case. Cuddesdon College. Agitation in the Oxford Diocese.
- CHAPTER XLVI.—Polemical Period, continued. Low-Church Dishonesty in regard of the Prayer-book. Agitation for Revision. Prayer-book Revision Society.
- CHAPTER XLVII.—Polemical Period, continued. Riots at St. George’s-in-the-East.
- CHAPTER XLVIII.—Polemical Period, continued. Rise of the Broad-Church Party. Its Characteristics. Line taken by Low-Churchmen against it. Proceedings against Prof. Jowett. Attempt against Mr. Maurice’s Institution.
- CHAPTER XLIX.—Polemical Period, continued. Publication of *Essays and Reviews*. Tendency of that Work. Proceedings against Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson.
- CHAPTER L.—Polemical Period, continued. Bishop Colenso of Natal. His heretical Publications. Proceedings with regard to him. Line taken by the Low-Church Party.
- CHAPTER LI.—Polemical Period, continued. Opposition at Oxford to Woodard Schools. Rev. J. W. Cunningham. Opposition to a Scheme for Missionary Bishops. Low-Churchmen hissed at a Church-Congress. London College of Divinity. Rev. Dr. Marsh. Rev. H. V. Elliott. Rev. Hugh Stowell.
- CHAPTER LII.—Polemical Period, continued. Improvements in Church Matters discussed or recommended by Low-Churchmen. Some Improvements deprecated. Abuses allowed.
- CHAPTER LIII.—The Immoral Period. Decline of the Low-Church Party in Spirituality, Moral Tone, and Intellectual Power.

CHAPTER LIV.—Immoral Period, continued. Failure of the Low-Church Party in controversy with Tractarianism. Employment by Low-Churchmen of Force and Compulsion. Occasion hereof—the Rise of Ritualism. Unreasoning Character (and yet Reasonableness) of Low-Church Opposition.

CHAPTER LV.—Immoral Period, continued. The Persecution becomes systematic. Formation of the “Church Association.” Distinct from the Prayer-book Revision Society. Manner of working. Liverpool Memorials against Ritualism. Agitation in the Salisbury Diocese. Clerical Vestments Bill. Guarantee Fund of the “Church Association.” Counter-declaration to a Catholic Memorial. Archdeacon Jacob’s Memorial. Rev. J. Ormiston at St. Alban’s, Holborn. Archbishop Longley and Mr. Weld. Disturbances in Stoke Newington.

CHAPTER LVI.—Immoral Period, continued. Commencement of systematic Persecution in the case of the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie: approved by the Low-Church Party generally. Visitation-charge of Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury; consequent Opposition: Meetings and Petitions. Ritual Commission. Low-Church Dishonesty. Pan-Anglican Conference. Low-Church Promotions. Further Proceedings against Mr. Mackonochie. Paid Spies.

CHAPTER LVII.—Immoral Period, continued. Commencement of the *Rock*. Proprietary Chapels. Persecution of the Rev. John Purchas.

CHAPTER LVIII.—Immoral Period, continued. Prosecutions of the Rev. Hooker Wix and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. Lord Shaftesbury’s Ecclesiastical Courts Reform Bill. Opposition to communicating in the Palm. Low-Church Refusals to associate with Ritualists.

CHAPTER LIX.—Immoral Period, continued. Agitation against the Athanasian Creed. Consecration of St. Peter’s, Clerkenwell. Bill for admitting Dissenters to Anglican Pulpits. Decease of the Rev. Henry Venn (the younger). Biographical Notice of him. Opposition to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Decoration of St. Paul’s.

CHAPTER LX.—Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. John Edwards. Public Worship Regulation Act. Lord Penzance. Commencement of Mr. Edwards’s Prosecution. New Suit against Mr. Mackonochie.

- CHAPTER LXI.—Immoral Period, continued. Memorial against the Rev. C. E. Hodson. *Christian Observer*. Memorial against Vestments and Eastward Position. Case of the Rev. Flavel Cook. Public Worship Regulation Act. Line taken by Low-Churchmen. Prosecution of the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale. Results.
- CHAPTER LXII.—Immoral Period, continued. Refusal of certain Bishops to license Curates for High-Churchmen. Persecution of the Rev. A. Tooth. Riotous and profane Conduct of Protestants at St. James's, Hatcham.
- CHAPTER LXIII.—Immoral Period, continued. Various minor Prosecutions and Attempts. *The Priest in Absolution*: Society of the Holy Cross. Agitation against both. Its hypocritical Character. Anti-Confessional Memorial.
- CHAPTER LXIV.—Immoral Period, continued. Low-Church Conduct at the Croydon Church-Congress. Low-Church Secessions. Conference of High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen at Lambeth. Low-Church Withdrawals from the S.P.C.K. Proceedings against Mr. Edwards. Profane Mob in his Church. Bishop Jackson and the Holy Cross Society. Further Proceedings against Mr. Mackonochie. Lord Penzance and Sir Alexander Cockburn. Memorial against Cuddesdon College. Third Suit against Mr. Mackonochie. Wycliffe and Ridley Halls.
- CHAPTER LXV.—Immoral Period, continued. St. Peter's, London Docks. Attempts of the "Church Association" to molest the Clergy there. Failure. Subsequent Conduct of the Association.
- CHAPTER LXVI.—Immoral Period, continued. Various Prosecutions and Attempts. Conduct of the Rev. R. O. T. Thorpe. More Attempts at Persecution. Low-Church Conduct at the Sheffield Church Congress. Prosecution of the Rev. P. Ahier for speaking ill of the *Rock*.
- CHAPTER LXVII.—Immoral Period, continued. Prosecution of Canon Carter. Bishop Ellicott and Mr. Ward of St. Raphael's, Bristol. Persecution of the Rev. T. Pelham Dale.
- CHAPTER LXVIII.—Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. S. F. Green. Prayer-book Revision Society and Bill. The Deans' Memorial in favour of Toleration. Counter-Memorials. Bills for amending the Clergy Discipline Act and Public Worship Regulation Act. Release of Mr. Green.

- CHAPTER LXIX.—Immoral Period, continued. Continued Persecution of Mr. Edwards (Baghot de la Bere) and Mr. Dale.
- CHAPTER LXX.—Immoral Period, continued. Low-Church Promotions. Fraternising with Dissent. Low-Church Decline. “Neo-Evangelicals.” Dictation by the “Church Pastoral Aid Society.” Rev. R. W. Randall refused the Pulpit of Bristol Cathedral.
- CHAPTER LXXI.—Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. R. Enraght.
- CHAPTER LXXII.—Immoral Period, continued. The “Church Association” at a stand-still. Further Intolerance. Ruffianism at West Worlington. Riotous Proceedings at St. Jude’s, Liverpool. Attack on the Rev. N. Y. Birkmyre. Bishop Piers Claughton joins the “Church Association.” A Word for the Ritualists from Bishop Oxenden. Attacks on the Rev. G. C. Ommaney.
- CHAPTER LXXIII.—Immoral Period, continued. Decease of Archbishop Tait. End of the Mackonochie Case. The “Church Association” and Bishop Jackson.
- CHAPTER LXXIV.—General State of the Low-Church Party. The “Church Association” discredited. Bad Traits. Bad Account given in *Christian Observer*. Ministerial Inefficiency. Proceedings in Low-Church Places of Worship. Private Offices. Missionary Zeal. Workers. Ignorance in the Clergy. Hymnals: Kemble’s, Mercer’s. False Doctrine. Low-Church Interpretations of Rubrics. Persons preferred to Principles. Losses from Low-Church Ranks.
- CHAPTER LXXV.—What the Low-Church Party might have done. Bad Blood Effect of the Persecution on the Persecutors. Results of Low-Church Policy on the Moral State of the Nation. Special National Sins. Disestablishment of the Church. Lessons suggested by these ANNALS. Future of the Low-Church Party. Duties of the Church.

COLONIAL CHURCH SOCIETY.

TO THE READER.

[By some misadventure a paragraph has been lost which should have appeared in vol. i. page 442, after that paragraph which treats of the "Church Pastoral Aid Society." The omission was not found out till after the issue of that volume. It is here supplied, in the hope that the reader will not have been inconvenienced. The note on page 442 belongs properly to the sentence ending with the word "Anabaptists" on page 447 of the same volume, line 4 from bottom.]

About the same time (1835) was formed "the Colonial Church Society," afterwards amalgamated with the "Newfoundland School Society," so as to form what is now called "The Colonial and Continental Church Society." The theory of the original Society, in its constitution and principles, was, so far as we have been able to make out, such as to commend itself to the cordial attachment of Low-Churchmen calling themselves Protestant and Evangelical. No archbishop or bishop of the Church had, in his official capacity, anything whatever to do with it. It was a thoroughly party Society; as is that Society now existing of which it became a component part, and the work whereof has, we believe, been uniformly answerable to its theory.

ANNALS

OF THE

“LOW-CHURCH” PARTY IN ENGLAND,

DOWN TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP TAIT.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Polemical Period, continued. The Gorham Case.

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.”—ISAIAH v. 20.

THE year 1850 was remarkable for two events having important bearings upon the Low-Church party, and indeed upon the Church of England in general. Those two events were the conclusion of the celebrated “Gorham case,” and the Papal Aggression.

From the very beginning of the Low-Church movement, Low-Church people had been heterodox on the subject of Sacraments generally. And, to speak more particularly of Baptism, we have seen how unsound on this subject were the views entertained by all the principal Low-Church leaders. The *Tracts for the Times* had called forth this unsoundness into positive distinctness; and, what with this and what with the large spread of

Tractarian doctrines, matters had become ripe for a pitched battle between the two parties. Under these circumstances, the Rev. George Cornelius Gorham, Vicar of St. Just, Cornwall, had arranged for exchanging his living for that of Brampford-Speke-cum-Cowley, near Exeter, and on the 8th of November, 1847, applied to the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts) for institution to the latter benefice. The Bishop, in reply, declined instituting Mr. Gorham until he should have examined his doctrinal views and found them orthodox; and kept him waiting until the 17th of December, when he put four questions to him in writing; and continued questioning him on that and the four following days (Sunday excepted), and on an average of more than seven hours each day; and this while Mr. Gorham was certified by his medical attendant to be too weak for ministerial duties. At last the examination was suspended, Mr. Gorham deeming it necessary to go to London for advice. On the 10th of February, 1848, he renewed his application for institution. The Bishop, however, required Mr. Gorham to submit to more examination. To this, under protest, Mr. Gorham acceded; and the examination was renewed on the 8th of March, and continued on the two following days; fourteen hours being thus occupied. On the 21st of March the Bishop intimated his refusal to institute, on the ground of unsoundness in doctrine.

What object the Bishop had in prolonging the proceedings does not appear. The question of Mr. Gorham's soundness as to the doctrine of Holy Baptism might probably have been settled in a few

minutes, Mr. Gorham having distinctly avowed on the very first day of his examination the following as his view of the doctrine of the Sacraments as held by the Church of England and by himself: viz. that “where there is no worthy reception, there is no bestowment of grace.” * When asked whether every validly baptized infant is made in baptism “a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,” and is “by the laver of regeneration in baptism received into the number of children of God and heirs of everlasting life,” * and “born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,” † his answer had in effect been, Not absolutely, but only conditionally on repentance and faith: and the grace to repent and believe must have been given by God before the person could have received baptism rightly. All baptized infants who die before they commit actual sin have had this prevenient grace.

The Bishop having refused institution, Mr. Gorham appealed to the Court of Arches; and Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, then Dean of Arches, decided against him on the 2nd of August, 1849. In this judgment the ground of the Prayer-book was taken up, and the Articles and the opinions of the reformers treated as only secondary to it.

We may pause for a few moments to remark, If Mr. Gorham's doctrine had been true, and allowable in the lips of a minister of the Church, what words could have been too strong for denouncing the policy of a Church which, while admitting that

* Office for Private Baptism of Infants.

† Office for Public Baptism of Infants.

doctrine, should declare nevertheless over every person baptized at his font that he is regenerate, and thereupon call upon the congregation to give thanks to God accordingly!—of a Church which should teach all her baptized little ones without exception, as they grew up, to speak of their baptism as that wherein they were made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven!

Not one straw, however, did the Low-Church party care for the credit herein of the Church of England, though professing themselves her faithful members. It was not, in their opinion, their business to choose between the alternative of teaching according to the Prayer-book, on the one hand, and, on the other, that of ceasing to hold their charges in the Church. Rather, it was their business to teach according to their own private views, and the business of the Church's rulers to turn them out if they could. And therefore, when Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's judgment came out, upholding the Bishop of Exeter, and condemning Mr. Gorham, Mr. Gorham appealed to the Queen in Council, and had, in so doing, the sympathy of all his Low-Church brethren.

The Court of Appeal before which the case was thus brought owed its constitution in such cases to an oversight which had been made in the draft of an Act of Parliament passed some time before. By that Act (3 and 4 Gul. IV. c. 41) certain *ex-officio* members were appointed, and power was given to the Crown to appoint two other members, being Privy Councillors; and, further, to summon

any other members of the Privy Council to attend the meetings of the Judicial Committee. Thus it came to pass that for hearing Mr. Gorham's appeal there sat, on the 11th of December, 1849, Lord Langdale, Master of the Rolls; Lord Campbell, Lord Chief Justice; Mr. Baron Parke; Vice-Chancellor Sir J. Knight Bruce; the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington, and the Right Hon. Pemberton Leigh. To sit with them as assessors there were the two Archbishops (Dr. Sumner and Dr. Musgrave), and the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield). And judgment was delivered on the 8th of March, 1850. In it their Lordships never brought Mr. Gorham's real opinions to the test of the Church's formularies, but propounded a view of their own, and attributed that to Mr. Gorham instead of what he really held. Their view was that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism, but that the grace may be granted before or after baptism as well as in it. And this view they declared it lawful for a clergyman to hold and teach; and on the ground hereof they reversed the decision of the Dean of Arches, and ordered the Bishop of Exeter to institute Mr. Gorham to the living of Brampford-Speke. It is to be observed, however, that Sir J. Knight Bruce dissented, and so did another Judge; also, that the untruthfulness of attributing to Mr. Gorham the views which their Lordships did attribute to him was pointed out by the Bishop of London; but this occasioned no alteration of the judgment.

The Rev. Henry Venn, grandson of the author

of the *Complete Duty of Man*, was present in the Council Chamber when the judgment was delivered, and wrote in his private diary a graphic account of the proceedings. "At 1.30, Pettitt, John, and I went to Council Chamber; the doors were not opened; a great crowd in the streets. While waiting, Sir R. Price drove up, and I took advantage of his *entrée*; a friend of his took us up into the library. . . . When the doors were opened we made a rush, and reached the left-hand corner. . . . At length, the space beyond us being filled, the press partially subsided. The judgment then commenced; it was long before I could realise the solemnity of the scene, after the pressure and confusion that we had endured. Lord Langdale read the judgment with great clearness and emphasis. . . . Round the Council-table sat Lords Brougham, Campbell, and others; in the next circle of chairs were Lord Carlisle and many others; the avenues on each side of the room were crowded; in front of the Council-table were lawyers and a few select persons; and then the dense mass of the public wedged into every inch of space allotted to strangers. The various emotions depicted upon the countenances reminded me of Raffaele's cartoon of 'Paul Preaching at Athens.' My own mind was in a kind of trance at hearing such sound and Protestant sentiments propounded by the highest judicial authority of the kingdom. The judgment was a more decided and complete vindication of the liberty of our Church than I had dared to hope for. . . . At the conclusion the shouts, evidently involuntary, ejaculations of 'Bravo!' from many a

beaming countenance, the start which it occasioned to the Lords of the Council, and the eager ‘Hush!’ of the officers, gave a somewhat ludicrous turn. The court was then cleared. In the porch at the bottom of the stairs many of us assembled to congratulate each other upon the result.” And well they might; for a judgment which should have upheld the obvious sense of the Prayer-book as limiting the wider and laxer interpretation of the Articles would have made their positions in the ministry of the Church of England untenable legally as well as morally.

In pursuance of the decree of the Queen in Council, Mr. Gorham was instituted to his benefice, by (we believe) the Dean of Arches; and, having taken possession, he lost no time in repudiating the doctrine which the Judicial Committee of Privy Council had attributed to him. He remained in possession of his benefice until his decease, which took place in 1857. The Bishop of Exeter wrote and published a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he declared his refusal to hold communion with anyone, be he who he might, holding Mr. Gorham’s opinions; which letter was criticised by the Rev. William Goode, afterwards Dean of Ripon, in a letter to the Bishop. The Bishop held a Diocesan Synod on the 25th of June, 1850, with a view to putting forth a declaration on the subject of Holy Baptism. After Divine Service and a celebration of the Eucharist in the Cathedral, about 300 clergy of the diocese went in procession to the Chapter-house. A declaration was presented by the Bishop affirming the doctrine

of unconditional regeneration in baptism, and this declaration was in part accepted by the Synod. We say in part, for it was so modified as to affirm unconditional regeneration in the case of infants, but to deny it in the case of adults! thus making out, as was remarked afterwards by a layman, two baptisms instead of one. And in this modified, unsound form it was accepted by the Synod; which thus, as Archdeacon Denison pointed out, confounded between the gift conveyed in a sacrament and the blessing received.* As to the conduct of Low-Church clergymen of the diocese with respect to the Exeter Synod we shall have somewhat to say by-and-by.

The holding of this Synod was, we believe, the last great step taken by the Bishop of Exeter for securing the doctrine of the Church on the subject of Baptism. Indeed, so far as we have been able to learn, he never afterwards attempted to avoid instituting a clergyman on the ground of heresy concerning any part of the Catholic faith—at least, concerning those parts of it which Low-Church people generally denied or questioned. And the Low-Church party all over the kingdom were confirmed in their position within the Church of England.† And when a Low-Church clergyman, immediately after baptizing a child in church, proceeded

* The Declaration as proposed by the Bishop will be found in *Notes of my Life*, by Archdeacon Denison, p. 205, &c.

† Bishop Sumner of Winchester wrote thus:—"I have never yet met with anyone who has 'taken up Gorham,' in the sense of assenting to his doctrine; and certainly I, for one, disdain all sympathy with *it*, though not all sympathy with him, as believing him to be within the pale of the Church's tolerance."—*Life*, p. 337.

to say, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," and then to interpolate these words—"not one word of which do I believe," no one, so far as the writer was informed, ever attempted to bring him up for ecclesiastical censure.

The fact was, that a triumph had been achieved for the whole Low-Church party everywhere. The Judicial Committee of Privy Council had ruled that the statements of the Prayer-book needed not to be taken in their natural and grammatical sense, and had thus opened the door not only to the particular heresy held by Mr. Gorham, though ignoring, as we have seen, that heresy in detail, but also to Zuinglian heresy as well. For their Lordships had treated the Thirty-nine Articles as having practically a superior authority to the Prayer-book. With regard to the Thirty-nine Articles, the subscriptions of the clergy did not commit them to the acknowledgment of more than that the Articles were agreeable to the word of God; while, with regard to the Prayer-book, every beneficed clergyman had declared his unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by it. Again, the Thirty-nine Articles were binding on the clergy only; the laity were not committed to them in any degree whatever. The expressions of the Prayer-book, on the other hand, were put into the mouths of all members of the Church, whether clergy or laity. To the thanksgiving, for instance, offered up over each newly baptized child for its regeneration just effected, the laity were required to answer *Amen*:

and each child was required to say, before it could be presented for Confirmation, and consequently for Holy Communion, "in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." But the statements thus binding on all, and on some with peculiar stringency, were now set aside in favour of statements which were binding with less stringency, and on a number of persons comparatively small. Nor was this all. Of the Thirty-nine Articles King Charles I. had said in his Declaration, "Though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all clergymen within our realm have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established . . . and that even in those curious points in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them." And yet this was the document to override statements so remarkably clear and precise that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to devise statements which should be more so.

Such was the triumph achieved for the Low-Church party; a triumph giving them for the first time a legal standing in the Church of England so far as touched the doctrine of Holy Baptism: legal, we say, in a certain sense, though in another sense their position, being secured by the perversion of law, was still as illegal as ever. And this triumph was the first of a long series, of which it forms a fair specimen; illustrating the strength of the Low-Church influence, the cleverness of the arguments used in defence of it, the boldness of the Judges

in passing their decisions, however ignorant they may have been of theology, or however biassed in the interests of a party; and, as the result, the permissibility, according to Privy Council law, of accepting plain and precise formularies in senses the very reverse of what to ordinary perceptions those formularies declared.

It is, moreover, curious, though not surprising, to note that when, about this time, some six or seven Low-Church clergymen of recognised influence met together—the Rev. Charles Bridges, the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, and (as we believe) the Rev. Hugh Stowell, and the Rev. Francis Close, being among them—and when they sought to express what their own views severally were as to the positive benefits derived from Baptism, it was found that they all differed from one another.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Polemical Period, continued. Erection of St. Paul's College, Cheltenham. Papal Aggression. "Durham Letter." Dr. M'Neile on Confession and Absolution. Revival of Convocation. Exeter Synod. Episcopal Pastoral on Ritual. Division of Services. Evening Communion. Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome.

"To assist this detestable scheme
 Three nuncios from Rome are come over;
 They left Calais on Monday by steam,
 And landed to dinner at Dover.

An army of grim Cordeliers,
 Well furnished with relics and vermin,
 Will follow, Lord Westmoreland fears,
 To effect what their chiefs may determine.

Lollard's bower, good authorities say,
 Is again fitting up for a prison;
 And a wood-merchant told me to-day
 'Tis a wonder how faggots have risen.

The finance scheme of Canning contains
 A new Easter-offering tax;
 And he means to devote all the gains
 'To a bounty on thumbscrews and racks.'

—*The Country Clergyman's Trip to Cambridge.* In Lord
 Macaulay's *Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches.*

IN the year 1850 was erected the building known as St. Paul's College, Cheltenham. It formed the premises of that College for training Low-Church schoolmasters which had been established three years before. The promoters of the college being differently-minded from the founders of our old colleges, no provision was made for offering the daily service of the Prayer-book, or for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, within the college precincts. The sixty resident students attended prayers in the large lecture-hall, and the services in St. Paul's Church on Sundays.

It need not be said, however, that this is not that great event concerning the Church of England to which we alluded in the last chapter. That event, which also happened in 1850, was the one known as the PAPAL AGGRESSION.

A few years after the Tractarian movement had commenced there had commenced a flow of 'verts (*converts* or *perverts*, according to the point from which they were regarded) to the obedience of the See of Rome. We have seen lists of 'verts for the years 1842, 1843, and 1844, numbering 19, 17 and 14 severally: but in 1845 the number rose to 68, including the honoured name of John Henry Newman, who had seceded from the Church of England not because an enlightened and independent conscience bade him, but merely because

everybody in authority said that he ought. And the lists for the three following years cover 60, 62, and 27 respectively.

News of all this, of course, reached the Vatican ; and the hopes of the Romanists for the return of England to the spiritual yoke of Rome were, no doubt, largely exaggerated to Pope Pius IX. This may have encouraged his Holiness to take, with regard to England, the step which he did take at the time whereof we speak : namely, to parcel out England and Wales into thirteen dioceses, and appoint a diocesan archbishop or bishop over each ; episcopal functions having up to that time been fulfilled, for members of the Roman Communion, by Vicars-Apostolic, taking their episcopal titles from places in Syria and other countries. This act of the Pope is described in the following terms by a 'vert :—" From the See of St. Peter was issued a decree, annihilating, as it had created, the Dioceses of Canterbury and York, Lincoln and Chichester—the cities of St. Augustin and St. Wilfrid, St. Hugh and St. Richard, were no more—they were blotted off the ecclesiastical map, and in their place were created Westminster . . . Beverley . . . Northampton . . . and Shrewsbury."

The whole mass of Anglican Protestantism went instantly mad. The Papal act was, of course, an insult both to the Church of England and also, perhaps, to the English Crown. But hardly anybody seemed to remember that such insults were but natural results of those Papal principles the existence of which was recognised by everybody. Romanists, as men, had as much right to carry their

principles into practice as any others of their fellow-men had to carry out theirs, provided only that they remained faithful in their allegiance to the Queen, and kept the Queen's peace: and no act of the Pope of Rome could really alter any English law, whether canonical or civil. And further, although some danger might arise from the fact that the Roman communion in England was now more perfectly organised than it had been before, yet such danger could only come contingently on Romanist principles being taught with greater zeal; and thus it might be entirely neutralised by the efficient teaching of such true Catholicism as was held by the Established Church. No one of these considerations, however, seemed to occur to any body at all, save only a very few. Anglican Protestantism in general went stark mad. Sermons were preached, indignation meetings were held, speeches were delivered, addresses were adopted and presented, and more speeches made in reply. In the case of Lord John Russell, then Prime Minister, the madness showed itself in the following letter, called the *Durham Letter* from its having been addressed to the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Maltby):—

“ My dear Lord,—I agree with you in considering ‘the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism’ as ‘insolent and insidious,’ and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject.

“ I not only promoted to the utmost of my power the claims of the Roman Catholics to all civil rights, but I thought it right, and even desir-

able, that the ecclesiastical system of the Roman Catholics should be the means of giving instruction to the numerous Irish immigrants in London and elsewhere, who without such help would have been left in heathen ignorance.

“This might have been done, however, without any such innovation as that which we have now seen.

“It is impossible to confound the recent measures of the Pope with the division of Scotland into dioceses by the Episcopal Church, or the arrangements of districts in England by the Wesleyan Conference.

“There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England, and a claim to sole and undivided sway—which is inconsistent with the Queen’s supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation, as asserted even in Roman Catholic times.

“I confess, however, that my alarm is not equal to my indignation.

“Even if it shall appear that the ministers and servants of the Pope in this country have not transgressed the law, I feel persuaded that we are strong enough to repel any outward attacks. The liberty of Protestantism has been enjoyed too long in England to allow of any successful attempt to impose a foreign yoke upon our minds and consciences. No foreign prince or potentate will be permitted to fasten his fetters upon a nation which has so long and so nobly vindicated its right to freedom of opinion, civil, political, and religious.

"Upon this subject, then, I will only say that the present state of the law shall be carefully examined, and the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumption of power deliberately considered.

"There is a danger, however, which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign.

"Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, 'step by step, to the very verge of the precipice.' The honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his charge to the clergy of his diocese.

"What, then, is the danger to be apprehended from a foreign prince of no great power, compared to the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself?

"I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their insidious course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall

be had in reverence by the great mass of a nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.

“I remain, with great respect, &c.

“J. RUSSELL.

“Downing Street, November 4.”

Every clergyman who did not run along with the mad public rendered himself liable, in proportion to the prominence of his position, to be charged with unfaithfulness to his trust. Thus, when Archdeacon Denison, in a letter to the *Times*, deprecated (1) the uniting with the Protestant sects against Rome (holding, as the Archdeacon did, all such union to be opposed to Church principles, and to be full of the utmost danger to those principles); (2) the putting aside, in the excitement of present alarm, the fact of the extreme peril to which the Church of England was exposed from the aggressions of the civil power; and (3) the appealing to the civil power to interpose between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, because he did not believe that the Legislature would find itself in any position to do in that matter what it was being asked to do, this letter caused him to be publicly challenged, by Mr. E. Ayshford Sanford, of Nynhead Court, with being unfit to discharge the trust committed to him in the Diocese of Bath and Wells as Examining Chaplain.*

Two more occurrences must be mentioned under the year 1850, though of comparatively small im-

* *Notes of my Life*, by Archdeacon Denison, pp. 210, &c.

portance. Dr. McNeile, preaching at St. Paul's, Liverpool, on the 8th of December, took occasion to refer to the confessional; and said (according to the *Liverpool Mercury*), "I would make it a capital offence to administer confession in this country. Transportation would not satisfy me, for that would merely transfer the evil from one part of the world to another. Capital punishment alone would satisfy me. Death alone would prevent the evil. That is my solemn conviction." He said afterwards that he had been misunderstood, and characterised the expression which he had used "as a most atrocious" one.* But his words were plain; and he never stated what he had meant to be understood by them, other than as they themselves implied.

The other occurrence to be noted here is that when four clergymen of St. Saviour's, Leeds, seceded to Rome, at the end of the year, and one remained faithful to the Church of England, that one (the Rev. W. Henry Frederick Beckett) was inhibited by the Bishop (Dr. Longley) from the exercise of all clerical functions in the diocese.†

We have already noted the formation of two Low-Church Societies, both, apparently, in rivalry to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts—to wit, the Newfoundland School Society in 1823, and the Colonial Church Society in 1835. In the year 1851 the two were united under one title, viz. "The Colonial Church and School Society." The name was changed in 1861,

* *Church Times*, August 20, 1860.

† *Ib.* March 2, 1877, p. 126.

as we shall see hereafter, to "The Colonial and Continental Church Society."

The same year (1851) is famous in the annals of the modern Church of England as that in which Convocation, after having been suppressed ever since 1717, assembled for the despatch of business. Faithful clergymen of the Church of England had been more and more confirmed in the opinion that the proper remedies for numerous evils from which the Church was suffering were to be sought through a revival of the Church's own constitutional legislative assemblies, the Convocations of Canterbury and York; and even the Presbyterian Dr. Chalmers had thought such revival reasonable, and said so.

The revival of Convocation, however, as of an active agent was deprecated by Low-Churchmen in general, and by the Archbishop of Canterbury in particular. Mr. Goode, indeed, thought that the practical extinction of Convocation was a hardship to the Church, and that the Church ought to be able to adapt her laws to the exigencies of the times; but he seems to have preferred a Protestant High Commission of clergy and laity together. The Editor of the *Christian Observer* wrote in his August number, "We see no reason to change our views as to the danger of calling either the ancient powers of Convocation, or a new machinery of the same kind, into action." * And when, in spite of opposition and ridicule, Convocation was allowed to deliberate *for three days*, the Editor still deemed that Convocation, as it then was, should not be permitted to act, and called for the large infusion

* *Christian Observer* for 1851, p. 580.

of a lay element : desiring that lay members should be chosen by congregations *or* communicants (the question of Communion as a test of qualification for an elector being apparently, in his view, an open one), and that such lay members should have licence to deliberate with the clergy, but to vote alone. Some years later, when Convocation had made itself somewhat of a power in the land, the policy of the Low-Church party was to labour for the election of Low-Church members. At present their tactics were those of general opposition ; prompted, no doubt, by the feeling that neither their theology nor their general religious system was in perfect accordance with the principles of the Church of England. Indeed, the *Christian Observer** expressed in 1859 “ a deep conviction that Convocation ” was “ positively injurious to the Church.”

It was probably the same principle which had influenced many Low-Churchmen of the Diocese of Exeter, with respect to Bishop Philpotts’ synod, mentioned in a former chapter. Out of about 800 clergy in the diocese, which then included the county of Cornwall, about 300 had been present in the Chapter-house at Exeter ; and of the remainder, more than 100 solemnly protested against the whole proceeding.

The deadness, however, of Low-Church churchmanship did not hinder the Church’s progress in the matter, so vastly important to her wellbeing, of the revival of Convocation. In December 1851 the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury met,

* *Christian Observer* for 1859, p. 214.

deliberated during three days, addressed the Crown, and appointed committees of both Houses for consideration of various matters. According to the *Christian Observer*, it was impossible not to see that the great powers of the Bishop of Oxford would be fearlessly, and (it was feared) mischievously, exercised in all the debates of that assembly.

In or about the same year (1851) most of the bishops united in putting forth a pastoral to the clergy.* This pastoral was much the sort of thing which was to have been expected, coming as it did from well-meaning people, of whom not one had made liturgiology a study, few, if any, were altogether sound on the principles of Divine Service, or indeed of theology in general, and all were anxious to avoid everything like a breeze. The unsoundness was manifested in the line which their Lordships took with reference to one particular "evil" (as they called it). A principle had, they said, been avowed "that, as the Church of England is the ancient Catholic Church settled in this land before the Reformation, and was then reformed only by the casting away of certain strictly defined corruptions; therefore, whatever form or usage existed in the Church before the Reformation may now be freely introduced and observed, unless there can be alleged against it the distinct letter of some formal prohibition." Against this the bishops had nothing to urge but their "clear and unhesitating

* This pastoral is printed in the *Life of Bishop Sumner*, pp. 350, &c., but no date is given. Nor is the date indicated in the *Christian Observer*, though, from one passage in that periodical, the pastoral would seem to have been issued before May 1851. (See *Christian Observer* for 1851, p. 359.)

protest." No shadow of an argument grounded on any shadow of a premiss : nothing but a protest ! What wonder that the ritual movement (as it soon came to be called) went on as steadily as it had done before ? Nor was the pastoral a whit more successful with Low-Churchmen than with the High-Churchmen. The bishops had besought all who, whether by excess *or defect*, had broken in upon the uniformity and contributed to relax the authority of our ritual observances to consider the importance of unity and order, and by common consent to avoid whatever might tend to violate the same. The Low-Church party, however, do not seem to have made (save in a few cases) any effort to attain even the minimum amount of ritual correctness required by the plainest rubrics.

The year 1852 deserves to be noticed as dating one of those few improvements in regard of Divine Service for which the Low-Church party can be peculiarly credited : we mean, the division of services. Many Low-Church clergymen, indeed, had commenced *evening* services properly so called ; and there had been in sundry churches early celebrations of the Eucharist, apart from Mattins ; but, ordinarily, no one had ever dreamt of offering Divine Service on Sunday morning without first saying Mattins as far as the Third Collect inclusive, then the Litany, and then the first part of the Eucharistic office, including the delivery of a sermon ; all these offices following one another in succession, with no other intervals between them save what might suffice for the singing of a few metrical stanzas : the whole occupying, it might be, two

hours, or even three or nearly so, if there was to be a celebration of the Eucharist.

To the Rev. J. C. Miller, Rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, belongs the chief honour of effecting a change in regard hereof. A Low-Church clergyman in the Diocese of Oxford had, indeed, preceded him in using the Litany as a Sunday afternoon service, reciting Evensong at a later hour; but Mr. Miller was, we believe, the first clergyman who carried out the principle of dividing the services to as great an extent as will presently be shown, and with the full approval of his diocesan. Though, by the way, that approval might reasonably have been withheld with regard to one item, to which we shall draw the reader's special attention presently.

In December 1851 Mr. Miller had issued a circular letter to his parishioners, announcing certain changes as about to take place in the conduct of Divine Service in their parish church in the following January, by way of experiment. The changes were accepted kindly by the congregation, and after six months, after some modifications which experience showed to be necessary, the following programme was finally adopted, of services for one month:—

First Sunday	Second Sunday	Third Sunday	Fourth Sunday	Fifth Sunday
	I. Early Communion. <i>No Sermon.</i>			
I. Morning Prayer, <i>omitting Litany,</i> Communion Service, Sermon, Lord's Supper.	II. Morning Prayer, Litany, Sermon.	I. Morning Prayer, Litany, Sermon.	I. Morning Prayer, Litany, Sermon.	I. Morning Prayer, Litany, Sermon.
II. Evening Prayer, Sermon.	III. Communion Service, Sermon to Young, or Catechising.	II. Communion Service, Sermon, Lord's Supper.	II. Evening Prayer, Sermon.	II. Litany, Communion Service, <i>without Lord's Supper,</i> Sermon.
III. Litany, Communion Service, Sermon.	IV. Evening Prayer, Sermon.	III. Evening Prayer, Sermon.	III. Communion Service, Sermon, Lord's Supper.	III. Evening Prayer, Sermon.

We might indeed demur, perhaps, to expressing approval of the recitation of any part of the Eucharistic Office at the altar by itself, such recitation tending, we should think, to obscure the nature of that part of the Office when forming part of a celebration. A far worse matter, however, was the proposal, which the reader will have noticed in the above programme, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist once a month in the afternoon, and once a month in the evening. Such a thing was not, indeed, absolutely without precedent, however contrary to

the usage of the Universal Church. Thus the Very Rev. Thomas Dale, an old-fashioned High-Churchman, was accustomed at one time to celebrate in the evening, solely for the purpose of affording more opportunities for the reception of the Holy Communion; and his example had been followed by many other clergymen of piety and learning. All these, however, like Mr. Dale himself, had soon given up the practice as not orthodox.* But the canon law by which the Church of England was (and still is) bound forbids the commencement of a celebration after midday. Feelings of reverence will prompt the well-instructed Christian not to receive that Bread which the Lord calls His Body into a full stomach, but rather, if possible consistently with spiritual freshness and activity, to communicate fasting; even as, when the Lord's Body, being in the state of death, was buried, It was buried in a sepulchre wherein no man had yet lain.

No thoughts of this kind, however, seem to have presented themselves to the mind of Mr. Miller; and his practice did but agree with his theology when he invited those parishioners who might desire it to communicate on the third and fourth Sundays of every month in the afternoon and evening severally. And in the course of time the practice found its way into almost every church which was in a town and served by a Low-Churchman. It was found a very convenient mode of testifying against the doctrine of the Real Presence, and of

* This was testified by Mr. Dale's son, the Rev. Lawford W. T. Dale, in a letter to the *Church Times* of September 16, 1881.

confirming Protestant hearers in their disbelief of that Catholic truth.

The same year (1852), the Rev. William John Early Bennett, having deemed, in consequence of certain correspondence with the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield), that he was bound in honour to resign the incumbency of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas's, Pimlico, was, on the presentation of the Dowager Marchioness of Bath (the Marquis being a minor), appointed to the vicarage of Frome Selwood, Somersetshire. Hereupon some of his clerical brethren, Low-Churchmen, remonstrated with the Dowager Marchioness. Complaint was also made to the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Gilbert) against the Rev. Arthur D. Wagner, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Brighton; in consequence of which the Bishop thought it necessary to remark on the enormity of which, it seems, Mr. Wagner had been guilty—that of giving to some members of his flock “pictorial crucifixes in height four and one-eighth inches by two and five-eighth [*sic*], and weighing two ounces,” which pictorial crucifixes (whatever that expression may have meant) were “well adapted either to be suspended in the closet or worn upon the person, or to be kept before the eyes on the table, in short, to be in either constant or occasional use, and therefore in a way to lead to a superstitious use of them.”

But the principal object of Low-Church warfare in the year 1852 was Miss Sellon and her establishment of Anglican Sisters: of which we will speak in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XL.

Polemical Period, continued. Miss Sellon and her Sisterhood attacked by the Rev. J. Spurrell. Prayer-book Revision Society. Low-Church plot for Religious Comprehension in Australia.

“Wherefore lookest Thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest Thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he ?”—HABAKKUK i. 13.

THE records of Mr. Ferrar's establishment, at Little Gidding, in Huntingdonshire, of persons devoted to a life of special religious observances, had been in the hands of Anglican Churchmen ever since Isaac Walton published his *Lives*. In the general revival of spiritual life, both individual and corporate, which had commenced in the Church of England, it was to be expected that in that Church, as in other ancient branches of the Christian community, attempts would be made sooner or later to revive monasticism in some form or other. Accordingly, we find that at the period to which in the course of our narrative we are now come such attempts had been made, and were being carried on. It was, moreover, to be expected that such attempts, in the utter lack of Anglican teaching upon the subject, should lead to various mistakes, some in respect of detail, and some even in respect of principle. And so it actually was: and Low-Church people were forward to use the mistakes as excuses for attacking both the system of monasticism, and also the persons who were endeavouring to carry it out.

Foremost in these attacks was the Rev. James

Spurrell, Vicar of Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire. "The Romanisers within our Church [said he] are now working . . . through a system most invidiously and artfully contrived . . . designed to entrap the unwary, and lead them ignorantly forwards, till they have made them, in reality if not in name, Romanists."

The above is extracted from a pamphlet published in 1852, and entitled *Miss Sellon and the "Sisters of Mercy." An Exposure of the Constitution, Rules, Religious Views, and Practical Working of their Society.* In support of his sweeping and serious charge Mr. Spurrell cited a letter from Miss Sellon, the Superior of the first-formed and infant Sisterhood; in reference whereto he asked, "Is not such an exhortation as 'Think of yourself as ever kneeling under the shadow of the cross, at His sacred feet,'—where the symbol is employed instead of the word [Miss Sellon having, in place of the word "cross," drawn a cross with her pen],—more likely than otherwise to have impressed Miss — with the idea, that, after all, Romanism, which is so fond of the display of this symbol, had reality on its side?" We will venture to affirm that no professor of Roman controversy ever taught his students such an argument for the reality of the Roman claims as this which Mr. Spurrell considered likely to have impressed Miss —. It reminds us of the trouble which some Christian missionaries had with Jews in the north of Africa many years ago. One of the Hebrew vowels, that which is sounded like the English *aw*, is represented by a mark like a T.

Now it so happened that in an edition of the Pentateuch which was being circulated amongst those Jews the type of this vowel had, in one particular place, a minute air-bubble adhering to the top of it; the result of which was that in some copies the impression of this type had the shape of a cross. And this was believed by the Jews (who did not know anything about printing) to have been contrived by the Christians to the end that when Jews used copies of the Sacred Book so printed, the cross might act as a spell, and convert them to Christianity! In the course of Mr. Spurrell's narrative we read, "Miss Sellon likewise expressed her belief that Miss —— was not fully acquainted with the faith in her own Church; as much that she had advanced as peculiar to the Roman, the Anglo-Catholic Church had always held, namely, the sacramental efficacy of confession, penance, the Apostolic succession, and prayers for the departed; and had ever upheld the religious vocation, though for a season it had been permitted to lie dormant. Confession, further, she stated, was practised by her children, who were under spiritual guides; and that the Holy Communion was administered to them every morning. After this she exhorted Miss —— to listen to the teaching of her own Church, *with all humility*, and there would be found no necessity for her to go into another Communion for what she sought after."

This exhortation, we should have thought, would have been sufficient of itself to repel the charge of Romanising. And indeed the intelligent reader

will have perceived at once how false were the charges brought against Miss Sellon, as far as we have stated them. Her accuser proceeded to stigmatise the Office-book used in her Society as having "much in it quite at variance with our Reformed Religion;" but in support of this position he specified nothing worse than a direction to sign oneself with the sign of the cross, and petitions for the faithful departed: and he asked, towards the conclusion of his so-called "Exposure," the questions which read like a sad satire—— "What does Protestantism, what does the Church of England know of the 'sign of the cross' being a sacramental symbol in the which there 'lies deep mystery?'" (This was in allusion to a passage cited from the Sisters' Office of Admission.) "What does the Church know of confession formally and frequently made to a priest? What of penance; of the keeping the 'Canonical Hours;' And what of conventual institutions?"

We say nothing of numerous statements made by this clergyman, but which Miss Sellon in her published reply denied. We have said enough to show the *animus* of Low-Church opposition to a movement which has now spread so much as to become one of the recognised agencies of the Church of England. But perhaps the most instructive point in the controversy (for Mr. Spurrell had the assurance to publish a rejoinder) was the tacit assumption on this writer's part that whatever was contrary to Protestant ideas was on that ground alone to be condemned. His appeal was almost invariably not to any common standard of

right and wrong, but to what Protestants think. And this was the line most frequently taken by Low-Church controversialists: if they began by appealing to Scripture, they most generally ended by appealing to popular ignorance and prejudice.

Of 1853 the only event bearing upon the Low-Church party which we have to chronicle is that mentioned by Archdeacon Denison in his *Notes* of his *Life*, to wit, that he, the Archdeacon, did all he could to take away from Mr. Gladstone his seat in Parliament for the University of Oxford in that year, and only failed in the attempt owing to Low-Churchmen's being (as he says) afraid of him.*

The next year (1854) witnessed the formation of the Prayer-book Revision Society, to which we shall draw attention more at length when, in the course of these ANNALS, we come to speak of the *Immoral Period*. And akin to this was the forming of a plot in England for execution abroad, to the detriment of the Anglican Communion in general; and the mention whereof belongs to this same part of our narrative. The case was what we shall now describe.

An extract from a letter written by the Rev. Henry Venn (the younger) to his brother in August 1854, and given by Mr. Knight in his *Memoir* of the former, runs thus:—"Praise God for the appointment of Frederick Barker to Sydney. Sir George Grey expressed himself highly pleased with the account of him. . . . All my spare thoughts are now devoted to the drawing up of suggestions for Barker and Perry to make the foundation of

* *Notes of my Life*, p. 103.

the Episcopal Church in Australia wide enough for a measure of comprehension. The colony is quite prepared for it, and longing to merge all sects in two—Protestants and Papists.”* Dr. Barker was consecrated in this year (1854) to the metropolitan see of Sydney; Dr. Perry had been consecrated in the year 1847 to the see of Melbourne. Both these prelates worked their dioceses on Low-Church lines as far as they could; and left them in consequence, when they did leave them, in a very low condition of Church life. One of them (we believe it was Bishop Perry) compelled a clergyman to leave the diocese because he held the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

The nature of the plot indicated in the above extract will be evident from the views held by the party to which Barker, Perry, and Venn belonged. It was not a design for winning over to the faith of the Church of England those who were in some respects denying it; it was not a plan for converting to the Church's religious practice those who were deeming that practice to be in some respects sinful; it did not aim merely at removing what a liberally-minded person must needs regard as stumbling-blocks to the uninformed, and to which the Divine Word ought to be regarded as applying—“Take up the stumbling-block out of the way of My people,” †—such as a mistranslation of Scripture, or the use of an old word in a sense not now commonly attributed to it. No: what Mr. Venn evidently contemplated, and what he evidently

* Knight's *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn, B.D.* New edition, London, 1882, p. 305.

† Isa. lvii. 14.

expected that the two above-named prelates would have laboured to effect—what, indeed, it is likely enough that they did labour to effect—was the relaxation of clerical engagements in such a way as, while perhaps shutting out from Anglican ministry more effectually than before those who held the Catholic faith in its integrity, would make room for those who denied that faith in one at least of its articles.

CHAPTER XLI.

Polemical Period, continued. Low-Church Opposition to the Sacramental System. Suit brought by Westerton. Sabbatarianism. Rev. H. Alford and the *Record*. Bishop Gobat and Schismatics in Scotland. Rev. Henry Cotterill appointed to the See of Grahamstown. Opening of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

THE *Christian Observer** speaks of the Tractarian movement as having been about this time in a state of gradual withering and decay. This must have been a case in which the wish was father to the thought; for although the Low-Church party had very much their own way, the prejudices of the general public being on their side, and although the bishops in general were ready to do what they could for discouraging Tractarians, yet there were not wanting indications of life and activity in the obnoxious party. In 1854 a petition had been presented to the Queen begging her Majesty to take measures that the sacramental system in the Church of England might be done away with; for that one place was not to be considered more holy

* *Christian Observer* for 1855.

than another place, or one person more holy than another person. This petition had been signed by fifty members of the House of Commons, and forty peers. In the same year Cuddesdon College had been opened in the Diocese of Oxford as a place of special education for the Anglican ministry ; and it speedily brought itself into the hostility of the Low-Church party, as we shall see hereafter. Mr. Westerton, too, a bookseller, and parishioners' churchwarden of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, distinguished himself by his warfare against various articles in use there. He had already, in his official capacity, taken upon him to remove floral decorations from the altar ; and he now took legal proceedings against the use in that church, not only of the carved oaken altar, with the cross and candlesticks, but also of the various coloured coverings for the altar, and such altar-linen as had embroidery or any other ornament about it : true to the traditions of Protestantism. Mr. Westerton had previously complained to the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) of the way in which Divine Service was conducted, and chiefly about the musical rendering of it, and the processions of incumbent and curates to and from the vestry ; but specifying also as objectionable the use of flowers for ecclesiastical ornament, and not omitting to notice that during the sermon the curates were guilty of the enormity of remaining " hidden from the congregation in the *sedilia* by the side of the altar, like monks and Roman Catholic priests."

To this suit we shall have occasion to refer again : we only notice its commencement here as

showing the mind of the Low-Church party towards everything which was not done in their way—everything beautiful about God's house—everything dignified about God's service. It was the same mind which had shown itself in 1837 against some Oxford clergy on account of their wearing surplices or scarves which had crosses embroidered upon them, and bowing at different parts of the service, and facing east at prayer; which had shown also much zeal against the figure of a cross in a stained-glass window over the altar; and in which an excellent clergyman of our own acquaintance received notice to quit the curacy which he held about the time to which the present chapter refers, and for no other alleged reason save that he had a bands-case or sermon-case (we forget which) made of velvet, and with a yellow cross worked upon it by one of his female parishioners.

The Sabbatarian views held by the Low-Church party gave practical offence this year to a large part of the London public. Those views were, it will be remembered, that the Fourth Commandment was as much a part of the Moral Law as any other precept in the Decalogue, and that therefore it was binding upon Christians as well as upon Jews, and would be binding till the end of time; there being, however, a certain latitude allowed for the sake of performing works of necessity or mercy. Only that the Apostles, acting under inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, changed the day from the seventh of the week to the first. A passage of Isaiah was considered as throwing light upon the manner in which the Sabbath was to be

kept holy; and the child of Low-Church parents was taught that on Sunday he was not to do his own works, nor to find his own pleasure, nor to speak his own words: that is to say, he was not to do any secular business, or to take any secular amusement, or to talk about secular matters. To which restrictions some Low-Churchmen added another, grounded on the words in Exodus, "Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." * Thus Mr. Bickersteth would not allow his servants to go out on Sunday. Sabbatarian views were held by the Low-Churchman Dr. Bird Sumner, now Archbishop of Canterbury. St. Paul had written in his Epistle to the Romans, "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." † These words, however, do not appear to have exercised practically any modifying influence at all upon Dr. Sumner's Sabbatarianism, though the perplexity which they do seem to have caused him when writing his Commentary on the Epistle he sought to avoid by ignoring the words altogether. And as, a few years later, a writer in the *Christian Observer* expressed the opinion that Volunteer bands ought not to play on Sunday when marching to church, ‡ so now it occurred to his Grace that he had, as Archbishop of Canterbury, an influence which

* Exod. xvi. 29.

† Rom. xiv. 5, 6.

‡ *Christian Observer* for 1860, p. 866.

might be usefully exercised against what he deemed to be Sabbath-breaking. So he addressed a letter to Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., then Chief Commissioner for Her Majesty's Woods and Forests, asking that the bands might be forbidden to play in the parks on Sundays. Naturally, Sir Benjamin shrank from opposing so great an authority in such a matter; and the order was in consequence given.

The question as to the obligation of the Lord's Day as a Sabbath was before the religious public at the time whereof we speak in other connections as well. And a strong Sabbatarian line was taken up by the *Record* newspaper. The *Record* had now been in existence nearly thirty years; and it was the one Low-Church newspaper, as the *Christian Observer* was the one Low-Church magazine. And as a magazine shows more than anything else what is the literary ability of those whose party it represents, so a newspaper may fairly be taken as an exponent of general character. And it shows this in those of its columns more especially which are devoted to letters from correspondents; for there the writers can show what is in their hearts under cover of signatures concealing their identity. Now the *Record* had for some time past been affording in this way a very sad evidence of that spiritual decline which had been going on in the Low-Church party almost from its very commencement. Archbishop Sumner described the temper and language of the paper as "execrable;" and the Rev. Henry Alford, then minister of Quebec Chapel, London, had soon occasion to write thus: "The

bold, large-print lie, followed by the insufficient small-print apology, which is again neutralised by the subsequently repeated lie." Mr. Alford was in the main a decided Low-Churchman; but his mind was larger and more independent than the minds of most other Low-Churchmen. And in the present case, having, along with another clergyman, stood up publicly to claim the exercise of Christian liberty for himself and his fellow-Christians in regard of the Lord's Day, denying that it was identical in any sense with the Jewish Sabbath, he was violently abused by the *Record*, in a series of articles the object of which was to *write him down*. The intelligent Churchman will not need to be told that in this matter Mr. Alford had the mind of the Church of England with him, as expressed in the book which has most authority as an exponent of her mind: for in that exposition of the Decalogue which is given in the Catechism, after speaking about the duty of honouring God's Holy Name, and His Word, nothing at all is said about honouring any particular day; but the answer proceeds—"To serve Him truly *all the days of my life*." Mr. Alford, however, was charged, in the Christian newspaper above named, with disingenuousness in reading the Fourth Commandment in the Communion-service, and was pronounced unfit to remain in the Church of England. To this he replied, in the second of *Two Letters to J. Sperling, Esq.*, saying, "If I were disposed to turn the tables . . . might I not fairly say, to which of the two does the charge most properly apply—to myself, who, regarding the commandment as not binding

in its literal sense, read it as interpreted by the Gospel and the Church; or to them, who, regarding it as strictly and literally obligatory on them, obey its command to observe *one prescribed day*, for a *definite assigned reason*, and in a *strictly specified manner*, by observing *another day*, for a *totally different reason*, and in a *manner entirely their own*; first praying that they may keep the law, then abrogating every word of it, substituting a new law of their own, and investing it with the authority of the other?" This, no doubt, was what a Low-Church writer—in the *Record*, if we remember right—termed “concentrated venom.”

Before leaving the Sabbath controversy, we may note the following evidence of the ignorance of Scripture among Low-Churchmen at this time. In the very first article in the *Christian Observer* for this year, entitled *The Sabbath was made for Man*, the writer spoke of the Lord as winding up “His argument with the words, ‘The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, for the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day.’” After such a gross misquotation* it need not be added that nowhere in that article did the writer give the slightest proof that he had himself any notion at all of what the Lord’s argument really was.

About the same time some scandal was given to the lovers of Church order by the conduct of Dr. Gobat, the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem. The

* The passage of St. Mark is: “And He said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath” (Mark ii. 27, 28).

Scottish Episcopal Church had found less favour in Low-Church eyes in proportion as its principles became known and were asserted. Low-Churchmen had a quarrel with it on several grounds. It asserted the necessity of an episcopate, handed down from the Apostles, for valid ordinations: it testified against Calvinism; and it testified to the truth of sacramental grace: on all which points Low-Churchmen denied the truth. We have seen before how Sir William Dunbar and Mr. Drummond had violated the principles of Christian unity by seceding from the communion of those bishops to whom they had previously given in their submission. Bishop Gobat now, being in Scotland, thought proper to ignore the Episcopal Church of the country, and to preach in some congregations which, by a curious misnomer, termed themselves "English Episcopal." Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen wrote thereupon a letter of protest to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated June 28, 1856. Accidental circumstances hindered the Archbishop from replying immediately. Then the Rev. Joshua Kirkman, minister of St. Paul's, Aberdeen, wrote to ask his Grace what notice he had taken, or intended to take, of Bishop Skinner's letter: adding, "If only our identity with the Church of England, and the wide separation from her of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in almost every part of her offices and constitution, were generally known in England, we should not be so isolated as we are. Your Grace's character is one of those supports we always remember as in reserve, and ready in time of need; and therefore I trust you will

favour me with such notice as you may think may conduce to the help of Evangelical truth and feeling in Scotland, and against a gratuitously hostile Church with whom we are forced into a certain amount of collision." In replying to this, the Archbishop expressed regret at the unfavourable light in which Bishop Gobat's conduct was seen by the Scottish bishops, as if Catholic bishops could have seen it in any other light; and his Grace did not omit to give the Scottish prelates an indirect snubbing, by adding: "I was much gratified by hearing the account which Bishop Gobat, since his return, has given me of the state in which he found your Church and congregation, and of his success both at Aberdeen and Glasgow."

The Archbishop had, this same year (1856), the opportunity of manifesting his care for Low-Church interests in another way. Dr. Armstrong, the first Bishop of Grahamstown, in South Africa, had departed this life. The Diocese of Grahamstown was one in the foundation of which few Low-Churchmen, if any, had helped; but a powerful effort was now made by Low-Churchmen to get one of their party appointed to preside over it in Bishop Armstrong's place, and so to neutralise the work which he, following Bishop Gray of Capetown, out of whose diocese that of Grahamstown had been taken, had been doing on Church lines. The result was, that on Archbishop Sumner's recommendation the Rev. Henry Cotterill, Principal of Brighton College, then a distinctly Low-Church institution, received the appointment. How Bishop Cotterill attempted to work the diocese

on Low-Church lines, how he found that on those lines it could not be worked at all, and how he learned by experience to become a decent Churchman, and a warm supporter of his metropolitan, Bishop Gray, belongs rather to the history of the Anglican Communion in South Africa than to the history of a party in England. We allude to the matter here as showing an instance of Low-Church zeal, which was not the less for being doomed to disappointment.

The year 1856 was signalised as being that in which the Theological College of St. Aidan, Birkenhead, was opened, for preparing candidates for the ministry of the Church of England. The institution had originated in a private theological class commenced, under the sanction of the Bishop of Chester (Dr. John Bird Sumner, afterwards archbishop), by the Rev. Joseph Baylee, afterwards D.D. The teaching was, as might have been expected, of a Low-Church character; but the college was not constituted on party lines. The bishop of the diocese was Visitor; and the only steps taken, apparently, for giving a Low-Church bias to the constitution were to make the Bishop of Liverpool another Visitor when the new Diocese of Liverpool had been formed and placed under the rule of Dr. Ryle, and to give certain officials of the new diocese shares in the government. For the Council consisted of the Dean of Chester (at the time of our writing Liverpool had no cathedral establishment under a dean); the Archdeacons of Chester, Macclesfield, Liverpool, and Warrington; the Chancellors of the Dioceses of Chester and

Liverpool; the Proctors in Convocation for both dioceses, and two examining chaplains appointed by the two bishops severally. These were all *ex-officio* members; and with them were associated eighteen laymen, elected by the Diocesan Conferences, four of whom went out yearly in rotation, though they could be re-elected. The course of study included the Old Testament in English, the New Testament in Greek, Ecclesiastical History, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Prayer-book. There were lectures, moreover, on preaching and other ministerial work, and the students were practised in English composition and Latin. Hebrew also formed one of the subjects of study, though not an indispensable one. The principal agent in the foundation of the College was Dr. Baylee, who became its first Principal.

CHAPTER XLII.

Prosecution of Archdeacon Denison. New Society for maintaining Low-Church Principles. Riotous Conduct at a Sister's Funeral. Privy Council Judgment about the Knightsbridge Churches.

THE Low-Church party had gained a legal victory in the result of the Gorham case. They were now to gain another victory; and a moral one this time, though not a legal one. The Judicial Committee of Privy Council had, at their instance, declared certain heresies to be not inconsistent with Anglican formularies, although the chief of those formularies contradicted the heresies in the most express terms. The Archbishop of Canterbury was now, at their instance, to declare, authorita-

tively and *ex cathedra*, certain Catholic truths, which were necessarily involved in the terms of Anglican formularies, to be inadmissible in Anglican teaching.

Archdeacon Denison writes thus in the *Notes* of his *Life*: "I was present with my dear friend Lord John Thynne, at the delivery of the Gorham Judgment, March 8, 1850. As we came down the steps of the Council Office I said to him, 'Well, what do you think will come next?'

"He said, 'I suppose you mean something about the other sacrament?'

"'Yes,' I said, 'and it will come very soon!' I did not think, when I said it, that it would come in my own person within four years from that day."*

The Bishop of Bath and Wells at this time was Dr. Richard Bagot. He had been translated from Oxford, where he had given the Tractarian movement some encouragement; and on his accession to the See of Bath and Wells he had made the Rev. George Anthony Denison, who was already Vicar of East Brent in that diocese, his examining chaplain, and subsequently Archdeacon of Taunton. The infirmities of age were now upon the Bishop; and he had been in consequence obliged to delegate the ministerial act of ordination to another bishop, Dr. G. T. Spencer, formerly Bishop of Madras, and a Low-Churchman. This prelate imagined that he had the responsibility of examining candidates, instead of simply ordaining those who were presented to him by the examining chaplain, and

* *Notes of my Life*, p. 190.

none others; and thus was generated some disagreement between Archdeacon Denison and his diocesan as to the necessity of imposing an acceptance of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist (which both Bishop and Archdeacon believed to be true in itself) as a *sine qua non* for ordination. This the Archdeacon had done and insisted on doing, in spite of Bishop Spencer's opposition. Bishop Bagot thought that the doctrine in question should not be imposed on candidates for Holy Orders as the Archdeacon had imposed it: and on this account the Archdeacon resigned the office of examining chaplain. He deemed it right, however, to preach three sermons in Wells Cathedral, in which he maintained the following Catholic truths:—

“I. That the bread and wine become, by the act of consecration, the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper; and, considered as objects of sense, are unchanged by the act of consecration, ‘remaining still in their very natural substances.’

“II. That ‘the Inward Part, or Thing signified’ is ‘the Body and the Blood of Christ.’”

“III. That the Body and Blood of Christ, being present naturally in heaven, are supernaturally and invisibly, but really, present in the Lord's Supper, through the elements, by virtue of the act of consecration.

“IV. That by ‘the Real Presence of the Body and the Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper’ is not to be understood the presence of an influence emanating from a thing absent, but the supernatural and invisible presence of a thing present; of His

Very Body and Very Blood, present ‘under the form of Bread and Wine.’

“V. That ‘the outward part, or sign,’ and ‘the Inward Part, or Thing signified,’ being brought together in and by the act of consecration, make the sacrament.

“VI. That the sacrament—i.e. ‘the outward part or sign,’ and ‘the Inward Part, or Thing signified’—is given to, and is received by, all who communicate.

“VII. That in ‘such only as worthily receive the same (the sacraments of the Body and the Blood of Christ), they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.’

“VIII. That worship is due to ‘the Body and Blood of Christ,’ supernaturally and invisibly, but ‘really, present in the Lord’s Supper’ under the form of Bread and Wine,’ by reason of that Godhead with which they are personally united. But that the elements through which ‘the Body and the Blood of Christ are given and received may not be worshipped.’”* (Where the Archdeacon spoke of worship being due to the Lord’s Body and Blood, we presume that he meant due to the Lord’s Person, really present in the sacrament by virtue of consecration: as otherwise he would have laid himself open to the charge of Nestorianism.)

The three sermons embodying the above doctrine were preached August 7th, 1853, November 6th, 1853, and May 15th, 1854. On the 16th of January,

* *Notes of my Life*, pp. 234-5.

1854, the Rev. Joseph Ditcher, Vicar of South Brent, wrote to the Archdeacon asking him to retract: which the Archdeacon immediately declined to do. Thereupon a prosecution was got up by the leaders of a society which Archdeacon Denison, in his *Notes of his Life*, calls the "Evangelical Alliance," but which probably was not the same as that the origin of which we have recorded, and of which Mr. Bickersteth was one of the most active promoters. The society which prosecuted Archdeacon Denison numbered among its principal members the Earl of Shaftesbury, Mr. A. Kinnaird, Mr. C. L. Bevan, and Mr. Wilbraham Taylor. The intermediate mover was Archdeacon Law of Wells, then Rector of Weston-super-Mare, and since made Dean of Gloucester. The ostensible mover was his official, Mr. Ditcher, just mentioned.* This Mr. Ditcher laid, in due course, a presentment before the Archbishop of Canterbury, praying for an inquiry. This was granted; and five clergymen of the Diocese of Bath and Wells were nominated by the Archbishop to inquire whether there was *prima facie* ground for further proceedings. The clergy who formed this commission were got together with extreme difficulty, and after many failures. They were, the Right Rev. Thomas Carr, Rector of Bath, and formerly Bishop of Bombay; the Rev. Charles Langdon, Vicar of Queen's Camel; the Rev. Reginald Pole, Rector of Yeovilton; the Rev. R. C. Phelps, Rector of Cucklington; and the Rev. C. O. Mayne, Vicar of Midsomer Norton. These met at Clevedon, and in January 1855 declared their unanimous opinion to

* *Notes of my Life*, p. 222

be that there was *prima facie* ground for further proceedings against Archdeacon Denison.

Meanwhile Bishop Bagot had died, and been succeeded by Lord Auckland, who came from the See of Sodor and Man. The new diocesan, however, was disposed to support Archdeacon Denison, against whom the proceedings were continued; Mr. Ditcher being supported, as we are assured by the Editor of the *Christian Observer*, "by the contributions of the really Protestant members of the Church, and the approbation of the whole Evangelical party." *

The reason why the Archbishop of Canterbury rather than the Bishop of the diocese had been moved to act in this case was, that both the living of East Brent and the Archdeaconry of Taunton were in the Bishop's gift; who might therefore be deemed a partial judge in proceedings against the clerk of his appointment. And in consequence of the conclusion at which the Clevedon commissioners had arrived, the Archbishop, acting for the time as bishop of the diocese, held a court at Bath, July 22nd, 1856, being assisted by three assessors, viz.: the Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, LL.D.; the Very Rev. George Henry Sacheverell Johnson, Dean of Wells; and the Rev. Charles Abel Heartley, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. In the course of the proceedings, Archdeacon Denison wished to show from Scripture and from antiquity that his interpretation of the Articles on the Sacraments was the true one. This, however, the court refused to allow; and the

* *Christian Observer* for 1861, p. 292.

Archbishop pronounced that the Archdeacon had contravened certain articles of the Church of England. The Archdeacon was offered ten minutes for recantation. At the suggestion of a friend he accepted the offer, and employed the time in substituting for his own words a passage from Bishop Andrewes. As soon as this passage was read by counsel it was condemned as being, not a retraction, but a reiteration of the offence charged. Thereupon the Archdeacon was allowed to the 1st of the October following for recantation. He appealed to the Court of the Province; and Sir John Dodson, then Dean of Arches, decided that Mr. Ditcher's suit must be dismissed, not having been commenced within the time (two years) prescribed by the Church Discipline Act.* Mr. Ditcher then appealed to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, and that court confirmed the decision of the Dean of Arches on the 6th of February, 1858.†

Before we leave speaking of the year 1857 we must note the formation, in it, of "The Church of England Clerical and Lay Association for the Maintenance of Evangelical Principles." This association seems to have been formed on a plan to which no objection could be made on general Christian principles. Its members proposed to avoid unnecessary interference with other parties, or the adoption of any course which might tend to rouse or to cherish a spirit of hostility or contention.‡ How long it continued in existence we do

* Letter from Dr. Walter Phillimore to the *Times*, reprinted in the *Church Times* of November 30, 1877.

† *Notes of my Life*, p. 241.

‡ *Christian Observer* for 1861, p. 685.

not know: but we fear that the period was not a long one.

A very different spirit showed itself towards the end of the year at Lewes, in Sussex. The commencement of Anglican Sisterhoods by Miss Sellon had aroused the antagonism of the more religious part of Anglican Protestantism, as we have seen. The funeral of a Miss Scobell, a member of another Anglican Sisterhood, gave occasion for an outburst of antagonism on the part of the uneducated rabble. It was with great difficulty that the funeral procession was able to proceed; the Sisters composing it were assaulted by the mob. The riot was caused by Miss Scobell's father, who circulated a story about his daughter's having been first inveigled into the Sisterhood, then persuaded to make a will in favour of the Sisterhood, and afterwards deliberately exposed to infectious disease in order that she might die, and that the Sisters of the society might succeed to her fortune; the fact being that Miss Scobell, who, when she joined the Sisterhood, was more than thirty years of age, had left the bulk of her property to her brother.

Next, however, to the prosecution of Archdeacon Denison, the year 1857 was chiefly remarkable for the judgment given by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in the matter of certain articles of church furniture in St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas's, Pimlico. The former of these churches had been consecrated by the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) on the 30th of May, 1843. The furniture of it included on that day a wooden altar with re-table, various coloured cloths for the

same, a wooden cross, and a pair of gilt candlesticks; also a credence. In the year 1855 Mr. Westerton, one of the churchwardens, instituted a suit in the Consistory Court of London against his colleague Mr. Horne, and the incumbent, the Hon. and Rev. Robert Liddell, to obtain the removal of those things. In the course of this suit persons of rank had joined with tradesmen in swearing that they were precluded from attending St. Paul's Church in consequence of their conscientious objections to the several articles of furniture whereof complaint had been made: thus reminding the student of history how when Laud had been made Dean of Gloucester, and had, with the consent of the Chapter, given directions for removing the altar from the middle of the choir to the eastern wall, the Bishop (Dr. Miles Smith, an inflexible Calvinist) vowed never to enter the cathedral again if the new Dean persisted in the course which he had begun: a vow which, it is said, he kept. St. Barnabas's Church was a chapel-of-ease to St. Paul's, and was served by curates under Mr. Liddell. This church had in it a fixed stone altar, with various coloured cloths, a marble credence, and a jewelled cross fixed to the re-table, which re-table was itself a part of the altar. It had also a pair of movable candlesticks, a rood-screen with brazen gates and a cross above, besides various cloths ornamented with lace and otherwise. In or about the year 1854 a Mr. Beal, an inhabitant of the district of St. Barnabas, had instituted a suit in the Consistory Court of London for the removal of these articles of furniture. The judge (Dr. Lush-

ington) deemed the altar and candlesticks at St. Paul's to be legal, but condemned as illegal the credence, the cross, and the coloured cloths. In the case of St. Barnabas's, he condemned all the things whereof complaint had been made. And on the 17th of January, 1856, he issued a monition against Mr. Liddell and the two churchwardens of St. Barnabas's, ordering the removal of all those things deemed illegal. Costs were not allowed in either case, Dr. Lushington declaring that he would not allow a party triumph.

Against these judgments appeal was brought to the Court of Arches, except as to the brazen gates of the screen, the candlesticks, and the candles; and with these exceptions Sir John Dodson affirmed the judgments of Dr. Lushington in all respects, and condemned the appellants in the costs of their appeal. This was in December 1856. Further appeal was then made to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council; and this court decided, March 21, 1857, that the cross over the rood-screen at St. Barnabas's was legal; that the stone altar with its fixed cross was illegal; that the credence was legal; that the coloured cloths for the altar were legal; but that the embroidery on the linen was illegal. The lords present at the delivery of the judgment were Lord Wensleydale, Mr. Pemberton Leigh, Sir John Patteson, Sir W. H. Maule, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Sumner), and the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield). Both prelates, it was stated, concurred in it.

In this judgment their Lordships showed how much knowledge they had of the subjects before

them by declaring that in the second Prayer-book of King Edward VI. "the prayer for consecration of the elements was omitted, though in the present Prayer-book it is restored!" In the authorised report, edited by Mr. E. F. Moore, this sentence was untruthfully altered to the following:—"material alterations were introduced in the prayer of consecration." The fact is that the prayer itself was identical with the one in use at present, save in the following points: "which" where we now have "who;" "we beseech Thee" where we now have "we most humbly beseech Thee;" and "Jesu" where we now have "Jesus."

The *Christian Observer*, which had given the name of "fantastic absurdities" to the several articles of church-furniture under question, and which had said, with characteristic nonsense, that it had "been attempted to graft" them "on the stock of simple Protestant worship," now remarked: "It is well that some settlement of these vexatious questions should be obtained, and we see nothing to dispute in the present decision. Neither can we see that Protestantism will suffer the slightest injury from a rose-coloured communion coverlid, or an ornamented credence-table, if people are so childish as to introduce them." Thus the Editor would fain make the best of what to Low-Churchmen was really a bad business.

CHAPTER XLIII.

Polemical Period, continued. Movement for Extra Preaching. Opening of Exeter Hall on Sunday Evenings. Opening of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey for Evening Services and Sermons. Special Services Aid Society. "Church Missionary Society" helps to increase the Episcopate. Fraternising with Dissent. Dean Alford and the "Evangelical Alliance" at Berlin. Turkish Missions Aid Society.

It is comforting to turn from the narrative of Low-Church zeal against Catholic usages and Catholic symbols, and to record efforts made by the Low-Church party in the interests of positive personal religion. Such efforts were made in the year 1857; efforts to spread religion among the working classes by means of more popular preaching than had hitherto been in general use.

In this they were provoked to jealousy by Dissenters. The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, a preacher of the Anabaptist denomination, who was born in the year 1834, had begun to preach when only nineteen years of age, to a little congregation at Waterbeach, in Cambridgeshire. While thus employed, he had achieved for himself such a reputation as a preacher that he received what was termed a "call" to fix himself in Southwark. And there, in May 1861, he opened his "Tabernacle," a building capable of accommodating six thousand hearers, and has kept the institution going, and with it an orphanage for four hundred children, and a "Pastors' College" (as it is termed), which, in the nineteen years subsequent to its opening in 1865, turned out six hundred preachers, five

hundred of whom served congregations at home, and the rest went abroad. To this remarkable man, or rather to his remarkable popularity, the Church of England owes indirectly a reform in certain details of her practice. We allude to the opening of certain cathedrals and other large churches for popular preaching and popular services. The Church was provoked to jealousy by the success which Mr. Spurgeon had attained at the period of which we write, though his "Tabernacle" was not then built. And the Low-Church party commenced action by organising public preachings at Exeter Hall on Sunday evenings. This was in the year 1857, in the end of May or beginning of June.

An obstacle was interposed by the Rev. A. G. Edouart, Incumbent of St. Michael's, Burleigh Street, in which parish Exeter Hall is situated; he refused to allow any such proceedings to be carried on in his parish by clergymen of the Church of England. The Earl of Shaftesbury, however, got an Act of Parliament passed whereby such obstacles could be removed in certain cases, and under this Act Exeter Hall was opened for public preaching by clergymen of the Church of England on Sunday evenings. The order of proceeding was, first a hymn, then the Litany, then another hymn, and afterwards the sermon. The clergymen who officiated were appointed by the committee, who paid their travelling expenses; in other respects their labour was gratuitous. The preaching was well attended; but unfortunately the committee and other persons who occupied the platform behind

the preacher set an example of irreverence by sitting while the Litany was being recited.*

These preachings, however, could not be kept up always, and then Dissenting preachers found their way to the platform of Exeter Hall as well as clergymen of the Church of England. But the movement led to the commencement of "special services" (as they were called) both in St. Paul's Cathedral and at Westminster Abbey; Evening Prayer being sung by volunteer choirs, and sermons delivered by specially appointed preachers. In St. Paul's these services were commenced on Advent Sunday, 1858, and continued for three months in each year, commencing at the same season till 1873, and since then on every Sunday evening throughout the year. In Westminster Abbey there had been special evening services in 1851, for the benefit of the strangers who visited the Great Exhibition in that year, and in 1858 they were resumed, and they were carried on in each successive year, from the first Sunday after Easter until the end of July. A further increase has since taken place, special services now being held on Sunday evenings in Advent and Lent as well.

The preaching movement took a further development within the Low-Church party, in the formation of the "Church Home Mission, or Special Services Aid Society," the character and operations of which are thus described in the *Christian Observer*:—"A committee was formed in London

* "Only three or four of those who sat even in the front row, with the officiating minister, set the example of kneeling; and some close to him sat with their legs crossed."—*English Churchman*, cited in the *Guardian* for June 24, 1857, p. 488.

of clergymen and laymen, with corresponding members, all of known Evangelical principles, in the country. A resolution was taken to employ as preachers those only of distinctly Evangelical principles. Beyond their expenses, the services of the preachers are gratuitous. In setting to work, the committee seek out parishes where the respective incumbents consent to a short service, consisting in general of the Litany, followed by a sermon, the whole being generally concluded within an hour. It arranges such parishes in the order of circuits, which are traversed in succession by the missionary brethren according as they are able to redeem time for the work from their own labours at home. . . . The committee approve of those to be invited, and then communicate with them. . . . There are now " [1859] " six circuits in different parts of the country—Surrey, Sussex, Herts, Wilts and Berks, Staffordshire, Worcestershire and Suffolk; these comprise thirty-four stations, which are visited during the season once a fortnight. They have an average attendance, in the aggregate, of from 14,000 to 15,000 people of all classes; and more circuits are about to be opened. . . . As many as twelve clergymen have been observed to be present on one occasion, and the letters from the incumbents in whose parishes the mission is received are of the most grateful character; while, as to the people, the incidents related are cheering and significant of good. Dissenters, drawn to the parish church, express their wonderment to find such preaching in the Church of England." *

* *Christian Observer* for 1859. p. 795.

About this time the "Church Missionary Society" seems to have received some new light as to the desirableness of establishing bishoprics for the superintendence of congregations gathered through the labours of their missionaries. The Society had, indeed, not refused to employ its influence in promoting the establishment of episcopal sees in countries more or less heathen; the bishoprics of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, the first occupants whereof were consecrated in 1814, 1835, and 1837 severally, had been founded partly or wholly at the instance of the Society, though not supported by it. And so also the bishoprics of Sierra Leone in Africa, Victoria in China, and Auckland, originally called New Zealand; the latter of which, however, was partially supported by the "Church Missionary Society" for many years. It was, however, in 1858 that the first episcopal see was established the occupant of which was to be supported by the Society altogether; that see was Waiapu in New Zealand. The see, also, of Wellington in the same country, which received its first bishop in this same year, was both founded partly at the instance of the Society, and also supported in part out of the Society's funds. And in subsequent years bishops were consecrated for Moosonee and Athabasca in North America (the latter of which two sees was since called Mackenzie River); Tinnevely in India, the bishop whereof was to serve as a suffragan to the Bishop of Madras; Travancore and Cochin, Caledonia in North America, North China, Mid China, and Eastern Equatorial Africa; all deriving their official incomes from the "Church

Missionary Society.” Whatever objections the Society may have entertained to the establishing of bishoprics abroad were obviated in these cases, for those clergymen who were consecrated to fill the new sees had been all, or almost all, in the Society’s employ already, and might then be expected to let their dioceses be ruled by the Home Committee in all matters in which that committee cared to rule, instead of asserting their spiritual authority when they deemed needful in opposition to the Society, as was done by Bishop Wilson of Calcutta, and still later by Bishop Jermyn of Colombo. But how little the “Church Missionary Society” knew, at an earlier time, of the spiritual benefits to be derived through organisation under bishops appears from a passage in a report of their Calcutta auxiliary association, which the Home Committee appears to have practically endorsed:—“The committee cannot refrain from congratulating their friends on the accession to their numbers of the Right Rev. the Bishop of Calcutta. Conformed as their proceedings had always been to the usage of the ancient societies of the Established Church, they could not but desire the official countenance of their Bishop. They have now that privilege, which, from the personal attention paid by his Lordship to the interests of the Society, not only promises to add greater efficiency to the committee’s operations, but also affords an additional security to the members of the Establishment that their measures will be pursued in strict conformity with the principles which the Church Missionary Society has always main-

tained." * The official countenance of the Bishop, and his Lordship's personal attention to the Society's interests—these are the sole grounds of their rejoicing at the accession of Bishop Heber to the number of their supporters; and we have no evidence that they ever realised episcopal superintendence as a sacrament of spiritual rule from the Lord Himself (however imperfectly administered).

To come back, however, to the Low-Church preachings at home, done by the Special Sermons Aid Society. It is not said that any Dissenters were led by those preachings to give up their dissent, and to accept the system of the Church of England. How much the Low-Church party had in common with Protestant Dissenters will be evident from the preceding chapters. There had been, in fact, a continual infusion, so to say, of Dissenting blood. Mr. Romaine's father had been a French Protestant. Newton's mother had been a Dissenter, and Newton himself had derived his religious views in part from a Captain Clunie, also a Dissenter. Cecil's mother was a Dissenter. Scott's mother was of Puritan descent. Dean Milner had made one of Jonathan Edwards's works a subject of careful study. Wilberforce had derived his religious views from Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*. Cowper had a Dissenting minister, the Rev. William Bull, for one of his intimate friends. Henry Thornton's father had been the teacher of a Dissenting academy. Zachary Macaulay was the son of a Presbyterian minister. Hannah More had

* Knight's *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn*. New edition (1882), p. 143, *note*.

studied Puritan theology, including Matthew Henry's Commentary. Nor was the relationship without some acknowledgment on the part of Dissenters. The Editor of the *Christian Observer* wrote: "It is, we hope, no discredit to us as Episcopalians, and certainly it is none to us on the general ground either of Christianity or of literature, that it was Dr. Dwight who first and most warmly introduced us to his compatriots."* This Dr. Dwight was President of Yale College, Connecticut.

Instances of fraternising with Dissent had been furnished from time to time by Low-Churchmen, when they could so act with impunity. The Eclectic Society in London, the object of which was theological discussion, numbered several Dissenting ministers among its members. Simeon had both preached and communicated in the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland. Nicolayson had allowed a Presbyterian to join with him in administering the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood at Jerusalem.† Edward Bickersteth had joined Dissenters in religious meetings, and had received benediction from some Dissenting ministers thereat. And in the year 1857 there was an instance of fraternising with Dissent which gave great scandal to sundry Churchpeople, not only by the nature of the act, but also by the eminence of the position which the offender held.

In that year there was held at Berlin a great conference of the "Evangelical Alliance:" and it was attended by Dr. Alford, Dean of Canterbury,

* *Christian Observer* for 1825, p. 296.

† See above, vol. i. p. 279.

amongst other English—the same person who, when Minister of Quebec Chapel, London, had been so abused by the *Record* for his views on the question of the Lord's Day observance. In the course of the proceedings it was announced that on Sunday, September 13, at nine o'clock in the morning, those English Christians who had come to Berlin for the purpose of attending the Conference would receive the Lord's Supper together. The Dean and his family went as recipients, and, after they had taken their places in the large saloon of the Hôtel de Russie, he was asked whether he would take part in distributing the bread and wine, the intimation being given at the same time that it was intended merely to read 1 Corinthians xi. 23–26 and distribute the bread and wine in silence. The Dean at once acceded. There was another similar communion on the last evening of the Conference in the Moravian place of worship: and on that occasion the Dean partook, but did not take part in the administration.* A sentence in a note to the Dean from his diocesan, Archbishop Sumner, and which refers to the Dean's conduct in this affair, illustrates the churchmanship of Low-Churchmen as being little else than a geographical accident. . . . “It is very right that at home we should keep out of *canon* shot, but, widely as the range has been extended of late years, I never before heard that it could be stretched across the Channel.”†

In this same year (1857) was formed the Turkish

* *Life of Dean Alford*, pp. 279, 280.

† *Ib.* p. 281.

Missions Aid Society. Its objects were, to assist with pecuniary grants the missions in Turkey, and more especially those of the American Dissenters who had been labouring there for the last half-century.

In order to appreciate the general character of these proceedings, it is necessary to bear in mind both those canons by the spirit of which every clergyman of the Church of England is bound, and also the promise which every priest makes at his ordination. Canon IX. enacts: "Whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the Communion of Saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules, in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, accounting the Christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England to be profane, and unmeet for them to join with in Christian profession; let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but by the archbishop, after their repentance and public revocation of such their wicked errors." Canon XXVII. runs thus: "No minister, when he celebrateth the Communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but to such as kneel, under pain of suspension, nor, under the like pain, to any that refuse to be present at public prayers according to the orders of the Church of England." And in the ordination of priests the bishop is directed to put the following solemn question: "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as

the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church and realm hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" To which each candidate makes answer, "I will so do, by the help of the Lord."

Low-Churchmen, however, grounded their Church principles on considerations not of what the Church of England was, and of what she required, but of what the Church of England ought to be, and of what she ought to require—in their opinion.* Time was when Low-Churchmen would not have dared to commit such irregularities as we have described. Fletcher of Madeley expected to be deposed from the ministry for much less misdemeanours, if indeed his proceedings could be called misdemeanours at all. As time went on, however, and the Low-Church party became numerous and powerful, Low-Churchmen became more bold in their contempt for Church rules and Church principles: until at last a bishop did not refuse to preach again and again in Presbyterian kirks, and as a Presbyterian minister. That, however, did not occur until more than twenty years after this.

Nor was the fraternising with Dissent the result of Christian charity pure and simple, or of real catholicity of spirit. Charity has respect to

* We have seen a letter to the editor of a country newspaper, in which the writer, combatting the statement that the Church of England was not Protestant, did so by saying that if the Church of England was not Protestant she ought to be so.

men as men: in the sentiment so well expressed by the heathen dramatist:—

Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto.
 “A man am I, and feel for all mankind.”

Catholicity has respect to man as baptized into Christ. It sympathises with all baptized people in virtue of the one Baptism which all have received. The Low-Church spirit, however—that spirit which showed itself in the ways just mentioned—was little else than a sympathy in religious opinions: those opinions being heretical as often as not. It was a sympathy with those who denied the Holy Catholic Church in the sense in which that term has always been taken; it was a sympathy with those who denied baptism as the means of effecting our union with Christ; with those who denied that the Lord’s Body and Blood are really present, in the Eucharistic paten and chalice, for our spiritual food and refreshment; with those who denied that our Lord Jesus Christ has left authority in His Church to absolve anyone at all; and with those generally who denied all sacramental grace. It was a sympathy with persons who were not only in separation from the Church of England, but more or less in opposition to her. It was a sympathy with them in their antagonism to many Catholic doctrines and Catholic usages.* It was an admission that Dissenting

* The writer has been present in more than one Low-Church family in which, when, at family worship, hymns were sung, the posture adopted was in each case that of sitting—the same which is commonly adopted by Presbyterians and other Dissenters when they sing in their public worship. And in all the Low-Church

ministers were as truly commissioned by our Lord Jesus Christ as those who had been validly ordained by the laying on of the hands of a bishop in accordance with primitive canon. It was an association against Popery, but including under the name of Popery whatever was felt to be inconsistent with Protestant unbelief or Protestant self-will.

CHAPTER XLIV.

Polemical Period, continued. Rev. A. Poole turned out of his Curacy for hearing Confessions, &c. Complaints against the Rev. R. T. West. Disregard of Truth. Promotions of Low-Churchmen by Lord Palmerston.

“Thou hast let thy mouth speak wickedness: and with thy tongue thou hast set forth deceit. Thou satest, and spakest against thy brother: yea, and hast slandered thine own mother's son.”—PSALM l. 19, 20 (Prayer-book version).

“Thou didst trust in thy way, in the multitude of thy mighty men.”—HOSEA x. 13.

THE two great sacraments of the Gospel had now been the occasion of proceedings in the courts of law, owing to the antagonism of Low-Churchmen to the Catholic doctrine thereon. One of the lesser sacraments—that is to say, the administration thereof—was now to furnish occasion for similar proceedings, and for the like reason.

Anglican Christians had, in God's goodness, come to realise in some measure the supernatural character of the state into which persons are

manuals of family prayer which he has seen, the model followed has been, not the Catholic one of short prayers, with versicles and responses, but the Puritan one of single prayers two or three pages long.

brought in Christian baptism. They had also learnt to discern the Lord's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist as present really, though supernaturally and spiritually. And at the same time, as was naturally to be expected, there had come to be realised in numberless cases a need of spiritual cleansing through some sacramental rite. Thus attention was drawn to the rite provided by the Lord Himself for such cases—the rite or sacrament of Absolution—to the existence of which in the Church, and by virtue of the Lord's institution and appointment, the Church of England had never ceased bearing witness; saying to her priests in their ordination, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained;" and bidding the priest move a sick person to special confession of his sins if his conscience is troubled with any weighty matter, and, after such confession made, to absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire absolution) in the same form which is still in use. The practice, however, which the Church thus contemplated had fallen into much disuse. A clergyman who was at this time a dignitary, and the incumbent of an important London church—the Rev. Archibald Boyd, then Honorary Canon of Gloucester, and Incumbent of Paddington, and afterwards, owing to a mistake of the Queen's,*

* The Queen had been much pleased with a work which came out anonymously at first, under the title *Thoughts of a Country Parson*. The title was misleading, for the author was really a minister in one of the Presbyterian communions. When the deanery of Exeter fell vacant, her Majesty, understanding that

Dean of Exeter—afterwards declared (and, if we remember right, with an expression of thankfulness to Almighty God) that he had never used the absolution for a sick person at all. And thus it was but natural, in the revival of the ordinance, that mistakes should be made, which might have been avoided but for the utter absence not only of experience in the case of those who had to administer it, but also of such teaching as they ought to have had at the hands of their ecclesiastical superiors. And, in point of fact, mistakes were made; and excuse was thus given to those with whom the revival of the ordinance was matter of fear—excuse of which those persons were not slow to avail themselves: excuse for manifesting their Protestant unbelief, and denial of sacramental grace in general. As, for instance, when, on the 8th of December, 1850, Dr. McNeile preached in St. Paul's, Liverpool, that he would have capital punishment inflicted on any clergyman who heard a confession; that transportation would not satisfy him—nothing would suffice but death.

Some complaints had been made to the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Gilbert) with reference to the proceedings of the Rev. John Mason Neale in receiving confessions: but it does not seem that the Bishop felt called upon to do more than refuse the sanction of his name any more to the sisterhood of St. Margaret at East Grinstead, and write to the

the name of the author was Boyd, desired that the deanery might be given to him. The Clergy List was then examined, and the Rev. Archibald Boyd was appointed, on the supposition that it was he who had written the book in question.

party who alleged himself to be aggrieved, about “that infatuated man at East Grinstead.”

The nature of the proceedings when confession is made with a view to absolution made it, generally speaking, impossible to substantiate with legal evidence any statements which might be made concerning such proceedings. To the priest it is a grave spiritual offence to reveal what has passed between him and a penitent; and the penitent is bound in honour to preserve a like silence. These considerations ought always to be borne in mind in estimating the character of such proceedings as those now to be narrated. But nevertheless it is remarkable that in both those cases in which public complaint was made in the year 1858 against clergymen on account of what passed between them and their penitents, the charges were formally and expressly denied. The cases to which we allude were those of the Rev. Alfred Poole, Curate of St. Barnabas's, Pimlico, and the Rev. Richard Temple West, Curate of All Saints', Boyne Hill, in the Diocese of Oxford. In each of these cases, the charge was that of putting immoral questions,—that is to say, questions bearing on the breach of the Seventh Commandment; and in the case of Mr. West, the further charge was brought of asking the penitent (a married woman) not to tell her husband what had passed.

The complaint against Mr. Poole was brought by a brother clergyman, the Hon. and Rev. F. Baring, in March. It was accompanied by the evidence of three who had posed as Mr. Poole's penitents, who had led notoriously immoral lives, and one

of whom had come to the priest for money, and represented certain questions as put to her in a more gross form than they really were. That Mr. Poole had acted indiscreetly in some respects is certain; but that he was guilty of anything worse (save the obvious enormity, to Protestant eyes, of receiving confessions and ministering absolution at all) no one dared to insinuate. And yet on these grounds, and on these alone, the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) summarily revoked Mr. Poole's licence, May 25. (It is to be observed that Dr. Blomfield had resigned the See of London in September 1856, and been succeeded by Dr. Archibald Campbell Tait, Dean of Carlisle, on the nomination of the Earl of Derby.)

Mr. Poole appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Sumner); asserting, among other grounds for so doing, that Mr. Baring's statements were entirely and deliberately untrue. The Archbishop, however, after a short correspondence with the Bishop of London, and without hearing Mr. Poole at all in his own defence, confirmed the revocation of his licence. Hereupon Mr. Poole applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a writ of *mandamus* compelling the Archbishop to hear his cause; which writ being granted, the Archbishop, with Dr. Lushington for assessor, held a court in the hall of Lambeth Palace, February 18, 1859; and after hearing counsel and receiving evidence, pronounced in the following month that good and reasonable cause had been given for the revocation of the licence. (The official confirmation was dated July 9th.) This judgment, the Editor of the *Christian*

Observer remarked, would cause thanksgivings to abound in every place where the purity of the Church of England was prized and had been felt to be in danger. Once more, therefore, he thanked God and took courage. A Tractarian clergyman had been turned out of his curacy, it mattered not whether for a grave moral offence or for a mere piece of indiscretion. In point of fact, it was for having merely used his own private judgment on points whereon he had no authoritative guidance at all, save what might have been given him by his incumbent. Unable to obtain justice from the Archbishop, Mr. Poole appealed to the Privy Council. That tribunal, however, pronounced the Archbishop's sentence to be final. This was in 1861. In the course of two or three months, however, Mr. Poole was presented to a living in the Diocese of Winchester, and no objection was made to his institution; the Low-Church bishop, Dr. Charles Richard Sumner, knowing that objection would be useless.

It is worth noticing here, as what was becoming a characteristic of the Low-Church party, how the most gratuitous misrepresentation was brought to bear by members of that party upon High-Churchmen. Besides the instance we have just seen, as afforded by Mr. Baring against Mr. Poole, the Editor of the *Christian Observer*, in an article upon Private Confession, spoke of clerical confessors as *selecting* their penitents, and of lady-visitors as *hunting up* penitents for the confessional. The intelligence or the veracity of the Editor was further illustrated by the following remark in the

same article:—"Whoever they are, then, who, within the Church of England, take the confessions of members of their flock, we will not say who urge them, but who permit them, who receive their people in their houses or in their vestries, in canonicals or out of canonicals, with such forms as Mr. Liddell prescribes, or without them, be the decision at Lambeth what it may, they are, we can say no less, dishonest members of the Church of England."* One would have thought that that rubric had been expunged from the Prayer-book, "*Here shall the sick person BE MOVED to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*"

The complaint against Mr. West was brought, July 14, 1858, by the Rev. John Shaw, Vicar of Stoke, the churchwardens of the same parish, and nine of the inhabitants, communicants in the Church of England; and asked the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce) to institute a full inquiry into the charges—published originally in the *Windsor Express* by a Mr. Joseph H. Clark, of Maidenhead, who had professed himself ready to substantiate them—and asking the Bishop further that, if the charges

* *Christian Observer* for 1859, p. 264.

were found true, the accused might be censured or punished. The Bishop thereupon commissioned Dr. Phillimore, Archdeacon Randall, the Rev. J. E. A. Leigh, and two others named Sawyer and Hibbert, to inquire accordingly. These commissioners, after a full examination, decided that the charge had not been substantiated. And the Bishop, in acknowledging their report, stated that he heartily accepted their decision as his own. The Editor, however, of the *Christian Observer*, in recording this, spoke of the Bishop as going on "to whitewash the particular offender." * So little was truth regarded when opposed to the interests of the party.

This may be a convenient place for remarking what an advantage the Low-Church party had at this time in a number of appointments to the Episcopate which were made. Lord Palmerston was Premier from June 18, 1859, till November 3, 1861, and in that time no fewer than eight sees became vacant through the death of their occupants. Now it so happened that at this time the Earl of Shaftesbury was in the confidence of the Government in ecclesiastical affairs. The Earl of Shaftesbury had for many years past been an encourager of various philanthropic institutions and schemes, but chiefly of such religious societies as were of a distinctly Low-Church character or constitution. And owing to the influence which he had with Lord Palmerston's Government, the following clergymen were promoted to the episcopal bench:—

The Rev. Charles Baring to the See of Gloucester and Bristol in 1856. On the decease, in 1861, of

* *Christian Observer* for 1858, p. 744.

Bishop Montagu Villiers, Dr. Baring was translated to the See of Durham.

The Hon. and Rev. Henry Montagu Villiers, Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, to the See of Carlisle in 1856. On the translation of Dr. Longley to the See of York in 1860, Dr. Montagu Villiers was selected to succeed him at Durham.

The Rev. Robert Bickersteth, Rector of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields, London, to the See of Ripon in 1857.

The Hon. and Rev. John Thomas Pelham, Rector of St. Mary-le-bone, London, to the See of Norwich in 1857.

The Rev. James Colquhoun Campbell, Rector of Merthyr-Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Archdeacon of Llandaff, and Honorary Canon of Llandaff Cathedral, to the See of Bangor in 1859.

The Ven. Joseph Cotton Wigram, Rector of St. Mary's, Southampton, and Archdeacon of Winchester, to the See of Rochester in 1860.

The Rev. Henry Philpott, Master of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, to the See of Worcester in 1860.

The Hon. and Rev. Samuel Waldegrave, Rector of Barford-St.-Martin, Wiltshire, and Canon of Salisbury, to the See of Carlisle, on the translation, in 1860, of Dr. Montagu Villiers to Durham.

The Rev. William Thomson, D.D., Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, and Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, to the See of Gloucester and Bristol in 1861. Dr. Thomson was afterwards promoted to the Archbishopric of York, on the translation, in 1863, of Dr. Longley to Canterbury.

The Very Rev. C. J. Ellicott, who had lately been made Dean of Exeter, to the See of Gloucester and

Bristol, on the translation, in 1863, of Dr. Thomson to the Archbishopric of York.

Of the clergymen thus promoted, not one appears to have effected any sensible improvement in his diocese. Dr. Pelham, on the occasion of a public fast-day, invited the clergy of Norwich to meet certain Dissenting ministers at the Palace for a "prayer-meeting;" which invitation, however, was, we believe, generally ignored. Dr. Campbell, at an ordination in the early part of his episcopate, omitted the administration of the Holy Communion on the ground that he was going to preach the same day in another church. Dr. Wigram signalled his episcopate by inveighing, in an episcopal charge, against the enormity of clergymen growing moustaches and beards. Dr. Philpott made no secret of his sympathy with Dr. Colenso's heretical party in South Africa. The same is only too true of Dr. Thomson. Dr. Waldegrave wrote a preface to a penny abbreviation of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. Dr. Montagu Villiers, as Bishop of Durham, gave the living of Haughton-le-Skerne, worth £1,600 a year, with a house, to a relative or connection, the Rev. Edward Cheese—a young man who had been not more than five years in holy orders—the population of the parish in 1860 being 6,793. This piece of nepotism gave occasion to an old clergyman of the diocese to remark that the appointment was not to be wondered at, for that *cheese* was always served before des[s]ert. When, soon after this, Dr. Montagu Villiers died, a Low-Church friend of the present writer avowed his belief that it was a judgment from God for the same piece of jobbery.

Dr. Baring took an early opportunity after his consecration of avowing that he could not help being a party man, and meant to administer the diocese as a party man. With regard to his administration of the Durham diocese, which he held from 1861 to 1879, it may be noted that the number of deacons ordained by him in the last four years of his episcopate was only 119, the proportion of graduates from Oxford and Cambridge was only one-fifth, and the number of persons confirmed only 17,504; while under the rule of his successor, Bishop Lightfoot, the number of deacons ordained up to Christmas 1882 was 134, though the last two ordinations had taken place since the separation of the Diocese of Newcastle; the number of graduates from Oxford and Cambridge was more than half, and the number of persons confirmed 25,530. Dr. Philpott, a friend of the Prince Consort, was more a Broad-Churchman than a Low-Churchman; and Dr. Ellicott was somewhat of a High-Churchman. The latter, however, learned to profess retractation of his views as to the ministry of supernatural grace in the act of ordination, and to make himself both despised and detested by the line which he took against the Ritualists—of whom more hereafter. And the greater number of these prelates wrought in the interests of the Low-Church party by never giving preferment, if they could help it, to any save Low-Churchmen. Great was the joy caused in consequence among the Low-Church ranks. In the year 1855 Lord Palmerston had contradicted not only one of the Articles of the Church of England, but

one of the favourite doctrines of the Low-Church party, by saying, at an agriculturists' meeting at Romsey, that all infants were born good. Now, however, all that heresy was forgotten: Lord Palmerston was almost canonised; and one enthusiastic writer of a small pamphlet called down blessings from heaven upon the noble viscount's head for having, by making such appointments as those just mentioned, saved us from "a national overthrow as a Church," whatever that expression might mean.

We do not know whether the two remaining episcopal appointments of Lord Palmerston—that of Dr. Harold Browne to the See of Ely, and that of Dr. Jeune to the See of Peterborough—were owing to Lord Shaftesbury's influence. If so, it may be well to remember that, although the former prelate was not a Low-Churchman, neither could he be truly called a High-Churchman; and that under the rule of Dr. Jeune, a pronounced Low-Churchman, the Diocese of Peterborough kept, if it did not gain, the appellation of "the Dead See."

Some deaneries also had fallen to the disposal of the Government about this time; and here also the inclinations of the Low-Church party were well consulted; with the result of sending the Rev. Henry Alford to Canterbury in 1857; the Rev. C. J. Ellicott (afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol) to Exeter in 1861; the Rev. Francis Close* to Carlisle in 1856; and the Rev. William Goode to Ripon in 1860.

* Who had been Vicar of Cheltenham for thirty-two years.

CHAPTER XLV.

Polemical Period, continued. Emotional "Revival." Lavington Case. Cuddesdon College. Agitation in the Oxford Diocese.

THE year 1859 was marked by the commencement of one of those movements which, commencing with good, have generally, if not always, ended in evil. We allude to the "Revival," as it was called, which originated in America, and spread to Ireland, Scotland, and North Wales. This movement, believed by its promoters to be a work of God the Holy Ghost Himself, was got up through preaching of a peculiarly emotional character; under the influence of which persons were wrought up first into a sensation akin to fear, and then impelled to cry out, and thrown down on the ground, or put into convulsions of an hysterical character, and afterwards changed (so to say) so as to be in a sensation of comfort and complacency, together with a kind of affection for other persons in the like condition. These emotions were believed by both preachers and hearers to be that conviction of sin, that godly sorrow, that repentance unto salvation, that joy and peace, and that love of the brethren, which some or all of God's faithful servants are described in the Holy Scriptures as experiencing.

It was remarked, however, that the manifestations had the character of an epidemic; the convulsions had the appearance of being infectious: when one person was struck down, others followed suit. The preaching which generated the manifestations was emotional rather than intellectual. In

one case they were produced by the preacher's manner of repeating, with a drawl prolonged each time beyond what it had been the time before, the word "hell."* Intellectual preaching, indeed, had rather a tendency to hinder the excitement; as at one revival-meeting, whereat a person present, thinking to help forward in the persons affected what he supposed to be a process of true Scriptural conversion, began to read from the Gospel the parable of the prodigal son, but was speedily interrupted with the cry, "You shan't spoil our meeting!" Nay, it was found in more than one case that the emotions generated were connected with an unhealthy excitement of the lower passions, and the direct result was a certain amount of positive actual immorality.

The line taken with respect to the movement by the *Christian Observer* was that of discriminating sympathy; sympathy with what seemed to be real conversions, but distinguishing between them and what it called extravagancies; and desiring that the movement might be guided by the clergy. Such, also, was the view taken by the Rev. Henry Venn: "that we must rise on the wave, or be overwhelmed by it."† For our own part, we believe the movement to have been not a spiritual one at all, but an animal one from first to last; affecting not the spirits of the persons concerned, but only their animal souls. As, however, we are not aware that this explanation of the phenomenon has ever been

* *The Work and the Counter-Work.* By Archdeacon Stopford Dublin, 1859, p. 41.

† *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn*, p. 322.

put before the public, we are not surprised that Low-Churchmen in particular should have failed to adopt it; though it was to their credit that the movement did not make way in England to any extent worth naming.

The struggle, however, between Protestantism and Anglo-Catholicism went on. In the year 1859 there occurred what was termed "the Lavington case." The Rev. R. W. Randall, Rector of Wool Lavington, in Sussex, was charged by the curate, the Rev. Edward Randall, with certain teaching as to the Sacraments; that is to say, counting seven sacraments, including "Extreme Unction" (which was defined as "a sacrament for comfort and peace of sick, and of persons in health, where expedient"), and also with wearing the garb of a Romish priest (what this was does not appear), crossing himself, crossing the water at the ministration of baptism, using the mixed chalice, and elevating the same in the celebration of the Eucharist. The charges as to the teaching were justified by a paper given by the Rector to the schoolmaster, containing heads of doctrine which the Rector wished to have taught. A copy of this paper was sent by the Curate to the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Gilbert), the *Times*, and the Earl of Shaftesbury; and thereupon ensued a correspondence. The Bishop, Low-Churchman as he was, took the part of the Rector; but not in a very creditable way. He acquitted the Rector of teaching Romish doctrine; and rightly, except as regards Extreme Unction; but he condemned him for Romish practices, apparently those Catholic usages of which complaint had been made, and

ordered him, moreover, to cease using that hymn of St. Thomas Aquinas, an English version of which contains these words :—

“ Word made flesh ! Thy own word maketh
 Very bread Thy flesh to be ;
 Wine the blood of Christ becometh
 What no human eye can see :
 Yet to every guileless spirit
 Faith will teach the mystery.”

The Bishop's order in this respect was accompanied by the admission that the hymn in question did not necessarily teach Transubstantiation.

One wonders how the Rector came to have engaged a curate of such different views to his own. Relationship was not the reason ; for though of the same name, there was no relationship between the parties. The Curate put his case into the hands of the “ Church Protestant Defence Society,” and that Society, after some delay, took the matter up. “ A letter from the secretary to the Bishop, containing a full review of the circumstances, and calling his Lordship's attention to them, received a bare acknowledgment. A second, signed by Lord Shaftesbury as President, was somewhat more successful. In a short but not very courteous letter, the Bishop replied that ‘ he thought it probable that Mr. Randall would give publicity to some further statement from himself.’ Six weeks having passed away without any further communication, the committee then made a formal application to the Bishop for a commission under the Church Discipline Act, which was met by a virtual refusal, his Lordship referring the committee to ‘ a printed

correspondence between himself and the Rector of Lavington.'” *

The line thus taken by the Bishop cannot surprise anyone who reflects that the action of the Curate could not give either the “Church Protestant Defence Society” or the Earl of Shaftesbury, its President, any business at all to interfere in the matter in question. The making themselves, however, busybodies in other men’s matters was beginning to be a characteristic of the Low-Church party. And indeed it was but one development of Protestantism in general, the unlimited exercise of private judgment being in the nature of things very closely allied to the making unlimited claim to responsibilities.

It appears by the printed correspondence that the Bishop had called upon the Rector to *state the charges against himself* and reply to them; and on the Rector’s doing this, had taken the questionable line to which we alluded before. Nor would the Bishop do more, although pressed by many principal parishioners of Woollavington and Graffham, headed by three of the churchwardens. Nor did any clergyman of the diocese seem willing to move.

The matter was then taken up by a person named Golightly, a clergyman, we believe, of the Diocese of Oxford: on what grounds does not appear, unless they were that same readiness to become a busybody in other men’s matters to which we have just referred. Mr. Golightly applied to the Bishop of Chichester for a commission of

* *Christian Observer* for 1859, pp. 612, 613.

inquiry, and, on being refused, applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a writ of *mandamus*. The rule was obtained, and the case in due course argued on both sides, and judgment deferred for a fortnight. Meanwhile Lord Campbell had succeeded Lord Chelmsford as Lord High Chancellor, and Sir William Erle had succeeded Sir Alexander Cockburn as Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. Of the remaining judges, Mr. Justice Wightman held that the Bishop of Chichester had a discretion under the Church Discipline Act, and was therefore legally able to refuse appointing a commission. And Mr. Justice Hill thought that the question of the Bishop's discretion was doubtful, but that at any rate Mr. Golightly, not being an aggrieved party, was not entitled to relief from the court. The court therefore decided against him, and in favour of the Bishop; and it was stated that in this decision Lord Campbell and Lord Chief Justice Erle concurred.

The hottest part of the warfare between Protestantism and Catholicism was at this time in the Diocese of Oxford. That diocese was then under the rule of Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, son of William Wilberforce of anti-slavery celebrity. Dr. Wilberforce's principles were, we believe, Low-Church; but with them he combined a regard for the Church of England as represented, to his view, in the Book of Common Prayer. Unfortunately for him, that view was no more than what is taken by persons accustomed to observe superficially: he had not inferred the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist from those two only words by which it

is taught positively and distinctly in the Anglican formularies: he held Baptismal Regeneration, and had, it was believed, incurred royal disfavour by insisting, against the wish of the Prince Consort, that the royal children should be taught the Church Catechism: but he does not seem to have perceived that that doctrine involves our partaking in Christ's resurrection-life. On these accounts, and owing also, perhaps, to a love of making things go smoothly between himself and others, even at the hazard of principles, he came to earn such nicknames as "Sly Sam," "Slippery Sam," "Soapy Sam," and to be fully trusted by no party at all.

The feeling, created by the study of Church-principles, that some more special training for holy ministry was required than the Church of England then provided, had led to the foundation of more than one distinctively Theological College. The Theological College at Chichester had been opened in the year 1839, and that had been followed by the opening, next year, of a similar college at Wells: the teaching in both which colleges was known to lean towards Tractarianism, on account whereof neither of them possessed the confidence of Low-Churchmen. And now, in 1854, the Bishop of Oxford had opened a similar college at Cuddesdon, the place of his episcopal residence.

In January 1858 the *Quarterly Review* had contained a strong article, in which Cuddesdon College was rather sharply handled. The chapel (it was said) had an altar in it, like a Roman one. At the

celebration of the Eucharist genuflections were made, and the chalice was rinsed at a piscina. A service-book also was used "concocted from the seven canonical hours of the Romish Church." These matters were brought forward again a few weeks later, in a *Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Oxford*, dated January 28, 1858, charging the teaching of the college authorities as tending "to sow broadcast the seeds of Romish perversion in the counties of Oxfordshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire." This clergyman was well known to have been the Rev. Charles Portales Golightly, Curate of Marston.

The Bishop asked the Principal of the College (the Rev. Alfred Pott, since Archdeacon of Berks) to reply to the charges. The Principal immediately replied that every one of the accusations was either false or frivolous. The altar was a simple wooden table. The only genuflections used were when the clergy knelt down to pray. The rinsing of the sacred vessels was done after the congregation had departed. The "social services" other than the ordinary Church services had indeed some few prayers taken from the same sources from which the Book of Common Prayer had been compiled, but the rule of their selection was "most strictly their entire agreement with the tone of our Reformed Church." And as to the ritual, Mr. Pott said: "We have faithfully adhered to the rules laid down by your Lordship, that our students should be accustomed with us only to what they would find in any well-conducted service in the

churches to which they might be appointed as curates. In obedience to this rule we have from time to time removed from the conduct of the service anything which either to your Lordship, or any judicious friend, appears" [he probably meant *appeared*] "questionable." (The things so removed appear to have been a small metal cross which once stood on the re-table, and a cloth with lace.) In concluding his reply, the Principal suggested that the Bishop should appoint a commission to investigate the charges, and report to him as Visitor. The Bishop did so, appointing the three Archdeacons of the Diocese. As, however, these were all personal friends of the Bishop, and two of them his own nominees, their report that Mr. Golightly's charges were unfounded was received, according to the *Christian Observer*, by the general public—that is to say, by the general run of ignorant and prejudiced Anglican Protestants—with a burst of scorn; and several criticisms of it appeared, in which the ignorance and prejudice of Low-Churchmen were abundantly manifested. One of the critics held that the painting and gilding on the walls and roof of the chapel, and the hangings at the east end, were enough to justify one of Mr. Golightly's charges. Much was made of the portentous facts that the altar had at the back of it a raised shelf, that its usual covering was of crimson velvet, but that in Advent and Lent it was vested in a darker covering. The *Christian Observer* found great fault with the expression, occurring in one of the "social services," "We confess to Thee, Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Ghost, that we have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, *through our fault, through our fault, through our grievous fault:*" on no other ground than that the last specified words were similar to those used at confession in the Church of Rome: and added, "And now let the reader say whether the Cuddesdon confession *suggests* any doctrine at variance with that of the Church of England."* According to the same sapient authority, the students were acting very questionably in praying that they might be *illuminated* with a *knowledge* of God's Word and *Sacraments*: that they might be united to God and to His whole Church *by His Holy Mysteries*; and that in all the stewards of God's mysteries the *sacred grace of Orders* might be stirred up and confirmed. Nothing more, however, was done, save the carrying on of a paper war, in which the pamphlets flew thick and fast, until the combatants were tired.

In January 1859 the Bishop of Oxford consecrated a new chancel to the parish church of Addington, in Buckinghamshire. This gave rise to more literary wrangling. The Diocese of Oxford, it was said, was in a highly dangerous state, for there were stone altars in six churches and three cemetery chapels; three Cuddesdon students had joined the Church of Rome; another student was identified with the *Directorium Anglicanum*, a work the object of which was to show how much of mediæval ceremonial might lawfully (in the writer's opinion) be used in the services of the Church of

* *Christian Observer* for 1859, p. 466

England; there was a stone altar in the church of Radley; and a stone slab, supported by blocks of wood, in the parish church of Wantage. Moreover, at the consecration of the chancel at Addington there had been processions with banners and a processional cross; and the like at Cuddesdon College, in 1855. Therefore, it was concluded, the diocese was the centre of a Romanising movement. Remonstrances followed, one of them signed by more than four thousand of the laity; and to the remonstrances there came, of course, replies. The Bishop said, in his reply to the clergy: "The processions have been the walking of the clergy, on occasions which have brought them together from different parishes, from the room in which they gathered to the church where the service was held, in an orderly manner, with the choir (if there were one) chanting a psalm. I believe that the real objection felt by many to this orderly walking to church is the dislike which they share with the elder Puritans to our distinctive dress of the surplice. I see no objection to such a devout and orderly walking to church. In some way or other the passage to God's house must be accomplished; and I esteem this a better way for ourselves and for our flocks, than that we should saunter promiscuously in, amidst the disturbance of general conversation; and I cannot therefore censure or forbid it." On which common-sense utterance the *Christian Observer* remarked: "Thus another of our ancient landmarks is broken down; if the Bishop of Oxford triumphs, it is gone for ever; and then, or we grievously misinterpret the signs

of the times, the Church of England will soon follow; for English Protestants will far rather see their Church destroyed than see it made the ape of Rome." *

CHAPTER XLVI.

Polemical Period, continued. Low-Church Dishonesty in regard of the Prayer-book. Agitation for Revision. Prayer-book Revision Society.

ΤΡΟΦΟΣ. ὦ τέκνον, ὄρκους μηδαμῶς ἀτιμιάσης.
 ΗΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΣ. Ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρενὴν ἀνώμοτος.
 EURIPIDES, *Hippolytus*, 607, 608.

NURSE. My child, by no means violate an oath!

HIPPOLYTUS. My tongue hath sworn, my mind unsworn remains.

WHILE the events narrated in the chapter just preceding were passing, a movement had been going on within the Low-Church party to which, although not extensive, the reader's attention must now be directed; a movement for revising the Book of Common Prayer in a Protestant direction.

From the very commencement of the Low-Church movement, Low-Churchpeople had had difficulties as to the use of various parts of the Prayer-book. Fletcher of Madeley, Henry Venn the elder, Thomas Scott, all disliked the Baptismal Service. Thomas Scott gives a hint, in his comment on John xx. 23, that he did not altogether approve of the form of ordination—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest . . . Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven," &c. The same divine, writing on the 5th of April, 1818, says: "I

* *Christian Observer* for 1859, p. 535.

have little objection to the doctrine or to the spirit of the Athanasian Creed." *Some* objection, then, he had. The Athanasian Creed was frequently omitted by him,* and by other Low-Church clergymen; and the like course was pursued in regard to the greater part of that exhortation which ends by recommending (in certain cases) special confession to the priest, with a view to the benefit of absolution. In 1833 the desire for a revision seems to have been entertained very generally among Low-Churchmen.† In 1840 the *Christian Observer* had spoken about "a few ill-understood passages in our offices" as causing brethren to stumble.‡ In 1845 a meeting at Alphington, in the Diocese of Exeter, had voted a revision of the rubrics to be necessary.§ A clergyman, also a magistrate, told the present writer that his informant was once present in a church where the officiating minister, after baptizing a child, and saying, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate," &c., interpolated—"not one word of which do I believe." Dean Boyd of Exeter professed, and (if we remember right) with thankfulness to God, that he had never pronounced absolution in the form given in the office for Visitation of the Sick. In Lincolnshire it was, we believe, a common practice to baptize in church with the form appointed for baptism in houses; thus getting rid of the necessity of sponsors. One correspondent of the *Christian Observer* had written in 1826: "I firmly believe that many sound

* *Life*, p. 338.

† *Christian Observer*, 1833, p. 601; see also for 1845, p. 174.

‡ *Ib.* 1840, p. 382.

§ *Ib.* 1845, p. 168.

Churchmen would be heartily glad to be freed from the burden of the Apocryphal lessons." * And another, about the "large class of our clergy and laity who lament the introduction of Apocryphal lessons into the service of our Church." † Dean Close of Carlisle told the Ritual Commissioners in 1867: "I never read the Apocrypha: ‡ I read through Job or Proverbs as long as the Apocrypha is appointed." § A correspondent of the *Church Times*, writing of a period a few years later, said: "I well remember some fifteen years ago" [i.e. about 1865], "when the Birkenhead clergy used to meet every Saturday for united prayer, how a respected and aged priest used regularly to adapt the words of the Litany to the feelings of Protestantism, and pray that God would bless 'all bishops, presbyters, and curates: ' thus getting rid of the obnoxious term 'Priests.'" || The Rev. Carr J. Glyn, in a speech made at an annual meeting of the Prayer-book Revision Society, May 9, 1882, said: "A great deal of harm had arisen from the consecration of the elements. He believed that for a hundred years that was not allowed in their Church." Henry Venn the younger, secretary to the "Church Missionary Society," made the following entry in his private journal on the 31st of December, 1849:—"Received a note from the Archbishop of Canterbury, approving of the resolutions which I had drawn up for the circulation of a selection from the Prayer-book in our native

* *Christian Observer* for 1826, p. 87.

† *Ib.* p. 600.

‡ Ritual Commission, p. 41.

§ *Ib.* p. 42.

|| Letter to the *Church Times* of October 22, 1880.

churches, instead of the whole book, with its Apocryphal lessons, rubrics, &c. . . ." That Archbishop was the Low-Church Dr. Sumner. The entry in the journal tells a long tale. Had it been in contemplation to print at once those parts only of the Prayer-book which were required for immediate use in native congregations—such as the offices for Adult Baptism, Mattins, Evensong, and the Holy Eucharist, *minus* the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, with the Litany, and Athanasian Creed, and those rubrics which refer to the duties of the people, and to leave all the rest to be added at leisure—no archiepiscopal consent would have been necessary. As the matter stands, however, it proves, we conceive, the existence, at the time, of a conspiracy between the Low-Church archbishop and the Low-Church priest, for imposing on the native congregations, not the Prayer-book of the Church of England, but one which had been expurgated on Low-Church lines, as far as Low-Churchmen dared to expurgate it.*

And every now and then the idea had been put forward by some zealous Protestant that the Prayer-book needed revision in a Protestant direction. As far back as 1844 a proposal had been put forth (by whom does not appear) for such a revision; which was to be carried out "*somewhat* on the plan proposed by the Rev. John Riland, in a work entitled *An Attempt towards an Analysis, &c., of the Book of Common Prayer*, published by Hamilton & Co." † And the continuance of the controversy

* *Memoir of Henry Venn, B.D.*, new edition, London, 1882, p. 197. For a kindred plot, see above, p. 31.

† Browne's *Annals of the Tractarian Movement*, p. 128.

with the Tractarians had made Low-Churchmen feel more and more that Tractarian principles were no other than those of the Prayer-book, and that as long as the Prayer-book remained intact, so long would the opponents of those principles find it an obstacle in their way.

In the year 1854 was formed the PRAYER-BOOK REVISION SOCIETY, with Lord Robert Grosvenor, afterwards Lord Ebury, for its President. The objects of it were set forth as follows:—

“PRIEST.

“The substitution of the word *Minister* or *Presbyter* for *Priest*, whenever the officiating clergyman is intended.

“ORNAMENTS’ RUBRIC.

“That the Rubric, commonly called the ‘Ornaments’ Rubric,’ be expunged from the Prayer-book, and some plain direction substituted.

“GENERAL RUBRICS.

“Such alterations as may avoid undesirable repetitions, and make the Services more edifying and elastic. A revision of the Tables and Calendar.

“ATHANASIAN CREED.

“That the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed be no longer imperative.

“COMMUNION SERVICE.

“Removal of a *few* phrases which have been alleged to favour Priestly Confession and Absolution, and other unscriptural doctrines and errors.

“BAPTISMAL OFFICES.

“Removal of expressions which seem to assert Spiritual Regeneration as *inseparably* connected with Baptism. A review of the Sponsorial system. The *Church Catechism* and *Confirmation Service* to be in harmony.

“ORDINAL AND VISITATION.

“The authoritative form of words accompanying the imposition of hands (*Receive, &c.*) to be rendered, as in primitive times and

through long ages, in the language of *Prayer*. The clause ‘Whose sins thou dost forgive,’ &c., in the ORDINAL, and the corresponding Absolution ‘*I absolve thee*’ in the VISITATION OF THE SICK, to be omitted.

“MARRIAGE SERVICE.

“The alteration or omission of some passages at present unsuited for public reading.

“BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

“Modification of *Rubric* respecting those *who die unbaptized*, and of expressions which seem to imply the salvation of *every one* over whom the service is performed.

“COMMINATION.

“Omission of the *Curses* and accompanying *Exhortations*.”

The Prayer-book Revision Society soon included the Rev. Richard Bingham, Incumbent of Queenborough in Kent, the Rev. J. N. Simpkinson, Rector of Brington in Northamptonshire, and the Rev. T. D. H. Battersby, Perpetual Curate of St. John’s, Keswick, in Cumberland, whom Bishop Waldegrave made a Canon of Carlisle: all of whom had declared their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Prayer-book, and all of whom held their several livings on the good faith of that declaration.

About the year 1859 the desire for revision broke out into still more public expression. We have now before us a pamphlet by the Rev. John Carysfort Proby, Rector of St. Peter’s, Cheesehill, Winchester, uncle to the present writer, and who, some years before, had submitted to be dipped in the river Itchen by an Anabaptist minister, and had thus incurred a three years’ suspension. In this pamphlet, which is a letter to his diocesan, Mr.

Proby laid down as the first thing to be particularly attended to the necessity of a careful revision of the prominent doctrine of the Liturgy, and a careful removal from every part of the Liturgy of whatever was found in any way to militate against the true and sincere and apostolic doctrine of the New Testament. And to the question, What is this peculiar doctrine of the Liturgy? he replied without hesitation, *Baptismal Regeneration*: the doctrine that all baptized members of the Church of England are so sufficiently born of the Holy Spirit at their infant baptism as to become members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven: which doctrine, said he, had no Divine authority, but was “a tradition of the Fathers, revived in the Church of England, *and not known elsewhere*” (!!!).

The same author spoke, in a subsequent part of his pamphlet, against the doctrine, implied in the Collect for the first Sunday after Trinity, that we can please God by keeping His commandments. He also, however, held his living on the ground of a professed assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Prayer-book.

In the following year (1860) there appeared a more bulky pamphlet, entitled, *Thoughts on the Liturgy: the difficulties of an honest and conscientious use of the Book of Common Prayer, considered as a loud and reasonable call for the only remedy, Revision*. This also was by a beneficed clergyman, the Rev. Philip Gell, Minister of St. John's, Derby. He commenced by calling his readers' attention to

what he terms the remarkable and important fact that within no great distance of time four leading heresies, with other errors, had forced themselves on the attention of the members of the Church of England, so as to be thought deserving of the most serious and authoritative counter-action : and then specifying these four heresies as (1) Auricular confession and priestly absolution, (2) the supposition of power to give the Holy Ghost by episcopal hands to every ordained priest, (3) the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and (4) that of Baptismal Regeneration, he adds : “It cannot well be denied that our ecclesiastical formularies are the real ground from which their origin has been derived.” The same line was taken by the Hon. and Rev. E. V. Bligh, Vicar of Birling, who wrote to the Earl of Derby (then Premier) on the *Roots of Ritualism and their remedy* : the remedy being, according to him, the excision from the Prayer-book of certain words “derived from Popery of the darkest ages.” This was in 1867.

“Often, very often, it is true” (we quote the words of one of these writers, speaking of the subscriptions required of candidates for Holy Orders and of candidates for admission to curacies or benefices), “there must have been a carelessness in such subscription, and an elasticity of conscience—as I am sure there was in myself—very hard to be given a good account of.” We should rather have said “*impossible* to be given a good account of.” Mr. Gell and Mr. Bligh had simply put their hands to a falsehood. They had solemnly professed assent to certain theological statements from which

they dissented in their hearts. When they had been ordained to the deaconship and priesthood, and when they had been admitted to their several curacies, it had been, in each case, on the ground of a subscription solemnly made, that the Book of Common Prayer contained in it nothing contrary to the Word of God. And when they had been admitted to their respective benefices, it had been on the ground of a still more stringent declaration, that of unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the said Book. It is not indeed possible, in our view, to justify the imposition of a subscription, in such terms, in reference to any merely human composition. There are, indeed, as everybody knows, forms of expression in common use amongst us which, taken by themselves, are not literally true. Any reader of these pages may have oftentimes ended a letter with the words, "I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant, ——," and yet not only have never dreamt of entering his correspondent's service in any capacity whatever, but have professed, in the very letter which he was finishing, an intention of doing the very opposite to what his correspondent had desired. Any reader of these pages, if a resident at any time in London, may have directed a servant to say "Not at home" to any visitor, and have given that direction without any the slightest intention of stirring out of the house. Nor is there anything morally wrong in the very least degree in either of these cases, because the expressions in question are recognised in general society as having, under the

circumstances, different meanings from what they have when taken by themselves alone. The phrase "I have the honour to be," &c., means no more than "Being, as I am, so and so, I wish to pay you all the respect due to you in your position." The phrase "Not at home" means, in London, "Not wishing to see any visitors." And so it might perhaps be argued, and maybe not unreasonably, with regard to the stringent subscription required of candidates for benefices by the Act of Uniformity, that no one understands it in the strictly literal sense, and therefore, that in making it in a somewhat relaxed sense one is not necessarily guilty of any real untruthfulness. The case, however, of those Low-Church clergymen who sought to revise the Prayer-book on the lines indicated by the Prayer-book Revision Society was not such as this. What they wanted was, not the change of a rubric for one more practical—not the alteration of an expression for one less antiquated and obsolete—not the rectification of a phrase wrongly translated from St. Paul—not the enlargement of the Prayer-book on its own lines by the insertion of additional forms for fast or festival, or of additional offices for which as yet no fully authorised provision had been made, though their need might be generally acknowledged—no! what these Revisionists wanted was the implied surrender, by the Church of England, of certain doctrines expressed in the Prayer-book, but which these Revisionists did not believe. Having been allowed, through the imperfection of ecclesiastical discipline, to expatiate within the limits of error, they wanted the land-

mark removed, that they might teach the error with easy consciences. Sad evidence of a perverted moral sense! for how could even a Divine enactment make a falsehood once told to have been then no falsehood at all? How could a new law concerning the admission to livings in July absolve a man from the charge of untruthfulness if he had received his benefice on false pretences in June?

Nor was the case materially altered when the terms of subscription were changed by Act of Parliament in 1863, for the subscription required then was still such as to exclude all in honesty who disbelieved any doctrine of the Prayer-book; and he who denied Baptismal Regeneration, or the validity of priestly Absolution, was just as dishonest in making the new subscription as he would have been had he made the one imposed by the Act of 1660.

Although, however, the Prayer-book Revision Society continued to exist, and continued to enrol among its members every now and then a Low-Church clergyman here and there, yet the agitation soon went down. Towards the end of 1859 a memorial was issued, with the signatures of Low-Churchmen and High-Churchmen alike, and deprecating all change in the Liturgy, on the ground that in the opinion of the signers the time for change was not yet come. It was generally felt, too, that to join the Revisionists while keeping a benefice or a curacy was to compromise one's own truthfulness; and on this account those who in their hearts desired to exclude Catholics from the Church of England, by revising the Prayer-book, were henceforward content for the most part to

seek the accomplishment of their desires in other ways, and to pose as faithful children of the Church, maintaining the Prayer-book in its integrity, with only a little laxity in some points never as yet made matter of question in a court of law, and prosecuting those who seemed to go one whit beyond its requirements. In the month of May 1860, Lord Ebury renewed in the House of Lords a motion brought in by him before for the Protestant revision of the Prayer-book, but was opposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Sumner). The Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) also intimated that even then a clergyman might omit part of the services with his Bishop's sanction, inasmuch as a late Act forbade the law to be put in operation against a clergyman for such an offence without his Bishop's sanction.

What means were adopted for the purpose of working Catholics and Catholicism out of the Church of England, and how far they were successful, will be seen hereafter.

It may be convenient here to notice that in the year 1861 the Colonial Church and School Society changed its name to "The Colonial and Continental Church Society," a large part of its operations being now directed to the providing of Low-Church clergymen to officiate on the Continent as chaplains to English residents and tourists there. These chaplains, we believe, fulfilled for the most part their appointed task diligently and faithfully—the task of misrepresenting the Church of England to the Continental Churches in respect both of doctrine and of ritual.

CHAPTER XLVII.

Polemical Period, continued. Riots at St. George's-in-the-East.

“Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?”—
ROMANS ii. 22.

WE have now the pain and the shame, both as Englishmen and as Christians, of recording a set of outrages, not indeed, alas ! entirely unprecedented, but never before, we believe, perpetrated on so large a scale since the restoration of the Church and the hierarchy after the rule of Oliver Cromwell, and perhaps never at all : outrages in which some Low-Churchmen were implicated, and which were encouraged, in Low-Church interest, by the Government. We allude to the sacrilegious riots in the church of St. George's-in-the-East, London.

The parish of St. George's-in-the-East was (and perhaps still is) one of the worst in London in point of morality. It abounded with boarding-houses for sailors, and with all the low public-houses, dancing-saloons, and other haunts which a seafaring population always originates. In the year 1857 or 1858 a careful survey was made, under the auspices of the East London Association, of a district immediately surrounding the parish church, and containing in all 733 houses. Of these 733 houses, twenty-seven were public-houses, thirteen were beer-houses, and 154 were houses of ill-fame. The entire population of the parish, for whose spiritual teaching the Rector was responsible, was originally forty-five thousand. This

enormous number was afterwards reduced, first to thirty thousand, and then to twenty-seven thousand.

In November 1842 the Rev. Bryan King, formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, was instituted to the Rectory of St. George's-in-the-East, on the nomination of his college. In the course of his incumbency he commenced various alterations in the established ecclesiastical routine of the parish, and in due time there not only was a daily evening service at the church, but there were also two celebrations of the Holy Eucharist every Sunday—one at 8 A.M., and the other after the forenoon prayers, which commenced at eleven. The surplice also appears to have been worn in the pulpit—at all events, at the sermon in the forenoon.

These changes earned for the new Rector not only unpopularity, but great hostility. Large public meetings were held, at which violent resolutions were passed: these resolutions were then circulated, in print, through the parish: and all other available means were employed for bringing public odium to bear upon Mr. Bryan King, and to thwart him in his work. All the ordinary supplies for conducting Divine Service were withheld. The church clock was stopped. The salaries of the church servants were suspended, the organist being only paid his salary on the express condition of his refusing to discharge the duties of his office. In spite of all this, Mr. Bryan King persevered in his efforts for the glory of God and the spiritual good of the parish.

It is to be remarked here that when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were deciding the suit concerning the ornaments and furniture of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas's, Pimlico, they uttered the following pronouncement:—"The rubric to the Prayer-book of January 1, 1604, adopts the language of the rubric of Elizabeth. The rubric to the present Prayer-book adopts the language of the statute of Elizabeth (1 Eliz. cap. 2): but they all obviously mean the same thing—that the same dresses and the same utensils or articles which were used under the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. may still be used." The rubric of that Prayer-book ran thus:—"Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope." ("Vestment," it will be remembered, means *chasuble*.) Just after the delivery of the judgment one of the Judicial Lords remarked to a friend, "We have just given the clergy authority to wear the Eucharistic vestments if they like. It is to be hoped they won't find it out."* The clergy, however, did find it out. The Rev. Thomas Chamberlain, Vicar of St. Thomas's, Oxford, was the first to act upon it; † and he encountered, in so doing, no opposition at all on the

* *Church Times* of April 4, 1884 (second leading article).

† Mr. Chamberlain put on a red chasuble on Easter Day, 1851. His congregation had already been accustomed to see Oxford hoods worn of extravagant dimensions. This was stated by the Rev. James Skinner, in a letter to the Rev. Henry Montagu Villiers, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge (p. 5, *note*).

part of his parishioners. In 1857 or thereabouts the Eucharistic vestments were presented to Mr. Bryan King, and their use urged upon him by several members of his congregation: thereupon he commenced wearing them at the early Eucharist.

St. George's-in-the-East is one of those churches where the parishioners or vestry have the power of nominating a Lecturer independently of the Incumbent. In these cases, the Lecturer, having been duly elected, and also licensed by the Bishop, fulfils his ministry in the church at such times as the Incumbent may allow. His stipend is derived from the foundation of the benefactor; like the stipends of those chantry-priests of whom there were so many in England in the times just before the Reformation. Now it so happened that the Lectureship of St. George's-in-the-East fell vacant in September 1858. The electors were the members of vestry, who had themselves been elected by the inhabitants of the whole parish under the provisions of the Metropolitan Local Management Act. The popular candidate was the Rev. Hugh Allen. In favour of him inflammatory placards were circulated through the parish, calling upon the parishioners to vindicate their own Protestantism by procuring Mr. Allen's election. Memorials to the vestry were also numerously signed, begging that Mr. Allen might be elected. These measures were successful, Mr. Allen being elected Lecturer on the 31st of March, 1859.

The Rector now interposed. Mr. Allen stood (says Mr. Bryan King) almost alone among the clergy of that district of London for the extrava-

gance of his tenets in the direction of Puritanism. He had in the previous December taken part with the friends of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, the well-known Anabaptist preacher, in a public meeting, and had there advocated the collection of funds for the purpose of erecting Mr. Spurgeon's "Metropolitan Tabernacle." And about four years previously he had, through his conduct when Lecturer of St. Luke's, Old Street, given great public scandal, and been compelled to resign that Lectureship. On these grounds Mr. Bryan King now wrote to the Secretary of the Bishop of London, protesting against Mr. Allen's being licensed to the Lectureship. The letter was received on the 15th of May: but (strange to say), without communicating with Mr. Bryan King, the Bishop (Dr. Tait) granted Mr. Allen his licence two days later.

Then was commenced that series of disturbances and outrages which continued, with an interval or two, for many months. On the Sunday following his reception of the licence, Mr. Allen, with the open support of the churchwardens, entered the church, at about twenty minutes before the usual afternoon Litany and catechising, amid shouts of "Bravo, Allen!" and, in spite of the protest of the Curate in charge (Mr. Bryan King being then absent from home), proceeded to read the Litany. He then mounted the pulpit, and, brandishing there in his hand the Bishop's licence, was greeted with repeated shouts of applause. Owing to the threatening aspect of the crowds in the precincts of the church, no attempt was made on the following Sunday to offer the usual Sunday

afternoon service ; but on the 5th of June, as soon as the church was opened for the Litany service, it was filled with the mob ; and on the entrance of the choir and clergy the hooting and shouting was so great that no service could be rendered, and it was not without difficulty that the clergy and choir escaped violence. The Rector was supported in the evening by several neighbouring rectors and other clergy, who felt that the cause was not now so much that of Protestantism against Catholicism as of ungodliness against Christianity. But the outrages were repeated, and it was with difficulty that Mr. Bryan King was rescued by his friends and several policemen from an attack of the mob. Partly in consequence hereof, and partly because the Chief Commissioner of Police had refused to allow the police to act within the church, the sacred building was partially closed on the two following days.

Meanwhile the vestry had applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* ordering the Rector to admit Mr. Allen into his pulpit. But the court decided that Mr. Allen's act on the 22nd of May was an intrusion, and that whenever the Rector chose to preach Mr. Allen must give way ; but suggesting that Mr. Allen should be allowed to celebrate a service of his own on Sunday afternoons, after the service which had been conducted under the Rector. Mr. Bryan King hereupon offered Mr. Allen the use of the church at five o'clock in the evening ; but this being deemed inconvenient to Mr. Allen and his hearers, his service was allowed to precede the Rector's, and to com-

mence at a quarter-past two o'clock. Under this arrangement Mr. Allen officiated on the 29th of June, and (as a local reporter averred) "did not forget that he stood in the pulpit of a Puseyite Rector, and was appointed in antagonism to him. He found occasion therefore to dwell repeatedly, and in a marked manner, on disputed doctrines, and pomp and ceremony, troops of choristers and Ritualism, as being opposed to 'the everlasting Gospel.'" * Thus excited, about two or three hundred of Mr. Allen's hearers, after Mr. Allen's sermon was over, remained in the church, and took possession of the stalls in the choir for the purpose of preventing the Rector's service from being held, in which object they succeeded. The same thing was done on the following Sunday. The Rector then intimated to Mr. Allen, through a solicitor, that if the four o'clock service was hindered again, he would require Mr. Allen's service to be held after it instead of before; and Mr. Allen's hearers, by the personal efforts of Mr. Allen himself and one of the churchwardens, were induced, on the following Sunday, to leave when his sermon was over. "And thus," said Mr. Bryan King, "I was permitted to conduct my afternoon service in comparative freedom from disturbance:" though, it may be added, on the authority of a letter from Mr. Bryan King himself to the *Guardian* newspaper, he had many anonymous letters threatening that, unless he allowed Mr. Allen to preach at the

* *East London Observer* for July 2, 1859, cited in the Rev. Bryan King's letter of remonstrance to the Lord Bishop of London, entitled *Sacrilege and its Encouragement*, p. 17, note.

four o'clock service, he should never be permitted to hold that service without disturbance.

This comparative freedom, however, did not long continue, and on the 14th of August the mob took possession of the choir stalls; and interrupted the Litany with hisses and shouts. And when in the middle of the service the officiating curate (the Rev. W. P. Burn) fell down in a fit, one of the rioters exclaimed, "It is a judgment of God upon him; God has struck him down: down with Bryan King!" After the service a cry was raised, "Let us attack the choir-boys!" some six or eight of whom had taken refuge in the baptistery from the mob. Some of the Rector's friends, on hearing this, placed themselves outside the baptistery door in order to guard it; and in defending their position there, one of them struck with his umbrella one of the ringleaders of the mob upon his hat, which the fellow, it seems, was wearing. The blow was returned. The churchwardens prosecuted the Rector's friend, and defended the original aggressor; and their expenses in that matter were subsequently paid by the vestry. And matters went on in this way for weeks and weeks together, Mr. Bryan King assenting, on the Bishop's recommendation, to Mr. Allen's holding his service at half-past three o'clock; and further, consenting to face eastwards no longer, as he had been wont to do at the ascription of Glory wherewith the sermons were concluded. This arrangement was put in practice on Sunday, the 6th of November. But if the Bishop imagined that the disturbances were about to cease on account thereof, the event

proved his utter mistake. The morning service was seriously interrupted, the Litany at a quarter before three still more so: to attempt offering the evening service was deemed inadvisable. The presence, however, of a force of police within the church caused some restraint upon the mob, and the interruptions became less and less serious until Sunday, the 1st of January, 1860, on which day it had been announced by placards the Rev. Hugh Allen would officiate in St. George's Church for the last time. That gentleman, it seems, had been appointed to the Rectory of St. George the Martyr, Southwark, on the Lord Chancellor's presentation, and to the Wednesday Lectureship of St. Olave's, Jewry. Unfortunately, in spite of the remonstrances of Mr. Bryan King with the Home Secretary (Sir George C. Lewis, Bart.) and the Chief Commissioner of Police (Sir Richard Mayne), the attendance of police at St. George's-in-the-East had been suddenly withdrawn; and from that day and onwards the disturbances increased at the afternoon and evening services, until on the 5th of February "the whole service was interrupted by hissing, whistling, and shouting. Several songs were roared out by many united voices during the reading of the lessons and the preaching of the sermon; hassocks were thrown down from the galleries; and after the service, cushions, hassocks, and books were hurled at the altar and its furniture." *

The worst feature, however, in this sad history is the complicity of the authorities with the sacri-

* *Sacrilege and its Encouragement*, p. 23.

legious rioters. If Mr. Bryan King had been correctly informed, it was a commonly used expression, at meetings of the "Anti-Puseyite League," in reference to any pending prosecution, "Oh, the magistrates dare not convict." Those magistrates were Messrs. Yardley and Selfe—the latter Dr. Tait's own brother-in-law. The Home Secretary not only refused to authorise the police to remove from the church persons who were undoubtedly guilty of trespass, and who had desecrated the church by acts of revolting impiety, but would not allow the police to take rioters into custody when called upon by the Rector himself.

Nor was the profane uproar the only way in which this unhappy church was desecrated. When the mob began to take possession of the choir-stalls for the purpose of excluding the choir and clergy, the Curate in charge asked the Bishop to direct that the churchwardens should appropriate those seats to the clergy and choir, but the Bishop replied that he could only do so through his court. Afterwards, however, when appealed to by the churchwardens, on behalf of the profane and riotous mob, to remove the choir-stalls altogether, he ordered them himself, without any reference to his court, to remove not only the choir-stalls, but the moveable cross which had been placed upon the re-table and the sanctuary hangings; those hangings being the very same which he had previously admitted to Mr. Bryan King were unquestionably legal, and with the like to which, he added, he had himself decorated the east wall of Carlisle Cathedral when he had been Dean of that church. Accordingly,

on Saturday, the 10th of March, the churchwardens entered the church along with carpenters and others, while the evening service was proceeding, and immediately upon its conclusion proceeded to put the Bishop's order into execution. This, however, was not until, on the afternoons of two Sundays, February 26 and March 4, a number of people who had persisted in remaining in church from about 4.40 P.M., when the afternoon service concluded, until the commencement of the evening service at seven, had eaten their afternoon meal in the choir-stalls, pelted the hangings behind the altar with orange-peel and bread and butter, and knocked down the altar cross with rods of stair-carpet; nor yet until, on the 4th of March, one of the altar carpets had been crammed into a large stove, and one person had made use of a pew for the filthiest of purposes. On Mr. Bryan King's informing the Home Secretary of these things, and inquiring whether the police sergeant had been justified in his refusal to remove the persons offending, he received no more than a bare intimation that the letter had been received. Only two offenders, on being prosecuted for creating disturbances, were convicted; and violent attacks were made upon the choir-boys, both in church and out of it. At last, Mr. Bryan King, being for the third time broken down in health by the struggle and its accompanying anxieties, left the parish in July 1860, on a year's leave. A clergyman of the name of Hansard took charge in his absence, and under Mr. Hansard's *régime* "every mob-demand" (said a correspondent of the *Union*)

“was eagerly conceded.” In 1863 Mr. Bryan King resigned the living, and became Rector of Avebury, a village in Wiltshire.

Nor were the lessons which the conduct of the authorities had taught lost upon Protestants in other parts of London, to say nothing of the country. “On the reopening of St. Philip’s, Clerkenwell, January 26,” says Mr. Bryan King, “several of the St. George’s rioters were present and attempted a disturbance; but the churchwardens did their duty and immediately ordered their removal by the police. On the evening of Sunday, February 19, several of the rioters, upon finding my church re-occupied by the police, adjourned to St. Matthew’s, Fell Street, whilst others of them went to the Wesleyan Chapel, Back Road, attempting disturbances in both places. On the very same Sunday several people attempted to create a disturbance at St. Martin’s Church, Liverpool, by calling out ‘No Popery,’ threatening to have a ‘St. George’s-in-the-East row’ there. And, strangely enough, on the evening of the very same Sunday, several people attempted a disturbance at St. Andrew’s Church, Halstead, Essex, by throwing peas, chestnut-husks, and orange-peel, whilst one man took a lucifer match and lighted a cigar. For these offences summonses were taken out by the churchwardens at the magistrates’ court, Halstead, February 23.”*

The stains of these proceedings must rest in some measure upon the Low-Church party. It is, no doubt, true, as asserted by the *Record* more

* *Sacrilege and its Encouragement*, p. 38, note.

than twenty years after, that Mr. Bryan King “was persecuted by a gang of ruffians because he interfered with their traffic.”* But Protestantism was the cry by which the rioters were mustered: it was the Low-Church Lord Ebury who presented a petition from certain parishioners against Mr. Bryan King, apparently for wearing the Eucharistic vestments; it was in the interests of the Low-Church party that Bishop Tait spoke and wrote. A majority of the rioters may very probably have been persons professing no religion at all; and yet when we hear of canticles and hymns being sung by many of the congregation at Mr. Allen’s service, we see at once that to those “many” such a description could not have applied. One of the letters received by Mr. Bryan King was concluded in the following terms—he cites it as an instance of many of a similar character:—“I hereby warn you that unless you desist from your hellish and Popish practice and preaching in our parish church, I shall take foul means to prevent your doing so: the proper place for you to preach in is H—ll, where you will soon be, as the devil’s claws are on you already. . . . I am one of a secret society which has sworn to see your downfall.—I am, A PROTESTANT.”† And “the Puseyite party” was the appellation commonly given in the parish to the Rector and those who sympathised with him, while an association got up against him was termed “the Anti-Puseyite League.” Moreover, we can have very little doubt but a fear of offending the Low-

* *Record*, December 8, 1882.

† *Sacrilege and its Encouragement*, p. 30, note.

Church party was the ruling motive which the Government had in taking the line which they did, shameful as that line was. Further, we may mark that in 1863 the Rev. James Hildyard, Rector of Ingoldsby, in Lincolnshire, wrote thus of the mob and their proceedings:—"From this cheerless prospect the so-called 'lawless and irreligious mob' of St. George's has (as far as rests with them) delivered us and our children. And if they have not altogether succeeded in their object, they have effectually prevented the triumph of their opponents, and put a check, which will be long remembered, to the stealthy progress of a system which, up to that period, was rapidly gaining ground in the kingdom, and whose ultimate tendency is to assimilate the Protestant worship of our churches to the more attractive but less spiritual character of those of France, Italy, and Spain." On which the *Christian Observer* remarked: "We cannot go with him to that length; but, in the principle which the parishioners designed to assert, we fully join with them: may it ever be courageously maintained!" And then the Editor proceeds to quote from Mr. Hildyard, *without any further disapprobation*, as follows:—"No Popery, no semi-Popery, shall be tolerated here. These men are not Puritans, as they have been called; they have no more sympathy with Geneva than they have with Rome. What they want, and what they will have, these men of St. George's-in-the-East—and with them concur the great bulk of the people of England—is the simple Word of God plainly and intelligibly delivered, without the invention or the

interpolation, the fancies or the follies of man. They want, in short, and will have, religion, not priestcraft—the substance, not the shadow—the spirit, not the letter, of the Gospel. And are they for this to be branded as rioters, as disturbers of the peace, outragers of the sanctity of the temple, profaners of the worship of God? I trust not.”* How the matter was regarded by the Low-Church party in general may be inferred from the following utterance of the same periodical:—“The respectable church-going people of England will not feel that justice has been done if the rioters are punished before the Romish exhibitions have been suppressed. They are afraid that, if order be restored, Tractarianism will be allowed to triumph in St. George’s-in-the-East; and of two fearful evils they prefer the least.”†

CHAPTER XLVIII.

Polemical Period, continued. Rise of the Broad-Church Party. Its Characteristics. Line taken by Low-Churchmen against it. Proceedings against Prof. Jowett. Attempt against Mr. Maurice’s Institution.

“Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it hath perverted thee; and thou hast said in thine heart, I am, and none else beside me.”—ISAIAH xlvi. 10.

FROM the physical danger caused by lawless mobs encouraged by rulers both in Church and in State, we turn to an intellectual and spiritual danger caused by false teachers; a danger which threatened

* *Christian Observer* for 1867, pp. 545, 546.

† *Ib.* March, 1860, p. 224.

High-Church principles and Low-Church principles alike, but which Low-Churchmen were least competent to resist.

About the same time when the Tractarian school in Oxford had been rising, there had come into prominence a school of a different character, and to which the name of "Broad-Church" came to be given, on account of the breadth of the comprehensiveness which it advocated. And yet that name was a misnomer. From the time when the party arose under Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and those like-minded with him, it was in as strong opposition to the Anglo-Catholic revival as were the most bigoted Low-Churchmen. Comprehensiveness for every form of belief *except Catholicism*—such was really the object at which the party aimed. Dr. Arnold thus expressed the points of agreement among Protestants, as he supposed them:—"We all believe in one God, a spiritual and all-perfect Being, Who made us and all things, Who governs all things by His Providence, Who loves goodness and abhors wickedness; we all believe that Jesus Christ, His Son, came into the world for our salvation; that He died, and rose from the dead to prove that His true servants shall not die eternally, but shall rise as He is risen, and enjoy an eternal life with Him and with His Father."* By which

* *Principles of Church Reform*, 1833, p. 29. Dr. Arnold added: "We all believe that the volume of the Old and New Testaments contains the revelation of God's will to man; that no other revelation than what is there recorded has been ever given to mankind before or since: that it is a standard of faith and a rule of practice," &c. (*ib.*) "We all have, with very few exceptions, the same notions of right and wrong," &c. (*ib.* p. 30.)

formulary, if it had ever become a public formulary, all intelligent authorities would have been excluded: for we do not believe that our blessed Lord rose from the dead to *prove* anything which was to be, but to bring in for mankind a principle of life which had never been enjoyed before, a spiritual life, in the power of which those who have been baptized into Him are enabled now to overcome sin, and shall be enabled hereafter to overcome death as well.

Nor was the party, strictly speaking, a religious party at all: religious, that is, with *Christian* religion. Its religion was a natural religion and nothing more. The present writer, visiting a cottager once in company with a Broad-Church clergyman, was complimented by the latter on having preached the Gospel when he had not given utterance to any religious truth at all. The party aimed at elevating and benefiting man in the flesh and as in the flesh; not as regenerated with the life of God communicated through Christ in Holy Baptism. The ground they took up was the common ground of humanity: very good and proper to be taken up if they had had to deal with heathens, and had aimed at civilising them and no more, but altogether wrong ground to be taken by those whose duty was to train a spiritual life, a life of which, so far as we know, none partake save those who have received the sacrament of Christian Baptism. And in thus seeking to elevate and improve their fellow-men, they had regard to man's intellect rather than to his spirit, and sought to train and improve the former rather than the latter. With them the intellect

was everything. Once, when Archbishop Whately was travelling abroad, writes a son of Dr. Arnold, who was then of the Archbishop's company, as the carriage passed "nearly all the people at work in the fields by the roadside, as soon as they caught sight of the three-cornered hat, left off working and went down on their knees, doubtless in hope of receiving an episcopal benediction. At the little town of Rötz, as the Archbishop was standing in the street while the horses were being changed, a wretched-looking man came up, threw himself on his knees in the mud before him, and with clasped hands and in supplicating accents began to mumble forth entreaties which our imperfect knowledge of German did not permit us to understand. The Archbishop looked at him askance, and with anxious eye, as if he were some remarkable phenomenon, and then turned abruptly away."* Evidently the thought never occurred to him that the poor man could be benefited spiritually by a benediction the words of which he did not understand. The same Archbishop had undertaken to consecrate a church. On the day appointed he mounted his horse and rode to the building, where a congregation and several clergy had assembled for Divine Service. Having dismounted, he proceeded at once to the altar, riding-whip in hand, and, all unvested, signed the deed of consecration, informed the astonished assembly that that was all which was legally necessary for the act of consecration, and rode away.

* *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., late Archbishop of Dublin* new, edition, London, 1868, pp. 206-7.

The unspiritual character of the Broad-Church school was strikingly exemplified in the following account, by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, of Abraham's calling and hopes :—“ Let us see how God led Abraham on . . . to look for a city which had foundations ; in short, to understand what a State and a nation means and ought to be.”* A State and a nation here on earth : that is all. The passage is taken from a volume of *Village Sermons*. Towards the conclusion of the same discourse the preacher gives his view of the object for which Anglican congregations are gathered :—“ This building belongs to the National Church of England, and we worship here, not merely as men, but as men of England, citizens of a Christian country, come to learn not merely how to save ourselves, but how to help towards the saving of our families, our parish, and our nation ; and, therefore, we must know what a country and a nation mean, and what is the meaning of that glorious and Divine word, ‘ a citizen,’ that, by learning what it is to be a citizen of England, we may go on to learn fully what it is to be a citizen of the kingdom of God.”† By one eminent Broad-Church writer, indeed, the terms “ spiritual ” and “ intellectual ” were used as synonymous.‡ And how utterly the Christian's standing in Christ by virtue of his Baptism was ignored may be seen by what Dr. Arnold, about the time of his going to Rugby,

* *Twenty-five Village Sermons*, 1849, p. 128.

† *Ib.* pp. 137-8.

‡ See Prof. Jowett's paper in *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 461.

wrote :—“ My object will be, if possible, to form Christian men, for Christian boys I can scarcely hope to make ; I mean that, from the natural imperfect state of boyhood, they are not susceptible of Christian principles in their full development upon their practice, and I suspect that a low standard of morals in many respects must be tolerated among them, as it was on a larger scale in what I consider the boyhood of the human race.”

The tendency of the Broad-Church school was, of course, to ignore the supernatural : and thus, in its development, its adherents were found, in some cases, to deny miracles, prophecy, and the special inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture. They took up, in reference to prayers for a change of weather, the argument used by infidels against all prayer whatsoever : not knowing that inasmuch as the Church is the Body of Christ, indwelt by the Holy Ghost, and inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is one in Godhead with the Father, the operations of the Father in the material creation will be of a piece with the working of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and, therefore, if the Father wills to order the course of nature in any particular manner for the carrying out of His purpose towards His people, the Holy Ghost will move the Church to make such ordering a matter of prayer, “ unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we

* Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, by A. P. Stanley, 6th edition, p. 449. It should be added that the note to the above passage is, “ See *Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 440.” His later sermons and letters seem to indicate that subsequently this opinion would not have been expressed so strongly.

ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.”*

Indeed, of theology, properly so called, the party had none. Its members professed to hold Justification by Faith, but with them faith was an act of the intellect alone: “fairness in listening to evidence, and judging accordingly, without being led away by prejudices and inclinations.”† And thus the Broad-Churchman’s faith—or rather what he called his faith—had nothing in it which was opposed to his natural self-conceit or self-reliance. And thus it became a matter of remark that so many of those trained at Rugby under Dr. Arnold and those who thought along with him, were remarkable for self-assertion and contempt of others.

The tendency to make the intellect into an idol showed itself pre-eminently in an impatience of that system of dogma on which alone true Christian faith can be built. Hence followed, naturally, a dislike to those expressions of dogma which are termed creeds; and more especially to that confession of our Christian faith which is commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius: and this, not only for its precise expression of the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, but for the declarations therein contained concerning that Catholic Faith whereof it is a confession, “Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.” Of this Creed Dr. Arnold wrote: “I do not believe the damnatory

* Eph. iii. 20.

† *Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences*, 1838, pp. 22. A little while before, it is said, “When they [the Sacred Writers] commend a man’s faith, it is because he listens fairly to evidence, and judges according to the reasons laid before him.” *Ib.* p. 20.

clauses in the Athanasian Creed, under any qualification given to them, except such as substitute for them propositions of a wholly different character. Those clauses proceed on a false notion, which I have elsewhere noticed, that the importance of all opinions touching God's nature is to be measured by His greatness; and that, therefore, erroneous notions about the Trinity are worse than erroneous notions about Church government, or pious frauds, or any other disputed point on which there is a right and a wrong, a true and a false, and on which the wrong and the false *may* indeed be highly sinful; but it does not follow that they *must* be." It will be observed, by the way, how ignorant Dr. Arnold there showed himself to be of the difference between *opinions* and *faith*. Dr. Temple also, one of Dr. Arnold's successors at Rugby, wrote thus of the Catholic symbols:—"We can acknowledge the great value of the forms in which the first ages of the Church defined the truth, and yet refuse to be bound by them."* So with regard to Christian dogma in its details: the members of the Broad-Church party professed to hold "the holy Catholic Church," but made out that society to consist, not of the baptized, organised in one body through the indwelling and operation of the one Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ the Head, but merely what we commonly term civilised society. And of course, when Broad-Churchmen sought, under the guidance of the late Archdeacon Hare, "to revive" what they deemed to be "a true ecclesiastical government, and to reanimate the

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 52.

Church," the means by which they sought to compass their object were the giving back those functions to her members which are now (as they said) "usurped by her ministers."* Thus Dr. Arnold would have had captains of vessels and commanding officers authorised (by Act of Parliament, we presume) to administer what he called the Communion.

What theology they taught was hardly anything save natural theology and philosophical deductions from it. Generalities about the universal love of God, a love which was in the end so to prevail that there would be no endless punishment for any—a love which would in the end so swamp man's free-will that all men would at last be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth in spite of themselves. But the more Broad-Churchmen rejected theological dogma, the more did the active ones among them lay themselves out for work of a certain character. They went in for secular instruction, working-men's evening classes, cricket-clubs, athletic sports, and such like things. And, no doubt, in these ways they did a great deal of good: only it was not religion.

That there had been Broad-Churchmen in the Anglican Communion ever since the times of Archbishop Tillotson and Bishop Burnet may very likely be true; though the party can hardly be said to have had any commencement as a party until the times of Whately, Arnold, Hare, and Thirlwall. Of the party in its modern form, Dr. Arnold of Rugby may perhaps be deemed to have been the

* Conybeare's *Essays, Ecclesiastical and Social*, p. 144.

principal leader. Others, however, in its ranks soon came to the front : such were Maurice, Stanley, and Kingsley, all of whom held important positions. Such also were the contributors to a volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, of which more will have to be said shortly. FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE was Professor of English Literature and also of Theology in King's College, London, and also Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. He was, however, deprived of his two Professorships by the Council of the College in 1853, on account of his teaching with reference to future punishment. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, the biographer of Dr. Arnold, was Examining Chaplain to Bishop Tait of London, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and afterwards Dean of Westminster, where he made himself notorious, when the revision of King James's Version of the Bible was to be commenced, by his invitation of the Unitarian Mr. Vance Smith, along with the other members of the Revising Companies, to receive the Holy Communion in Henry VII.'s Chapel ; and at a later period, by inviting persons not members of the Church of England to lecture from the Abbey pulpit. CHARLES KINGSLEY, after having got some fame as a novel writer, became Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. These, and such as thought with them, taught and preached and wrote, and their principles, being agreeable to man's natural self-conceit, spread rapidly among the educated classes.

The Broad-Church movement was to some extent a reaction ; a reaction from the dogmatism of the

Tractarians, a reaction from the unreality of Low-Churchmen. It was also a reaction from all which, whether in its abuse or in its lawful use, tended to confine or restrain the action of man's intellect: it was a protest against bigotry and narrow-mindedness in either party. Only, unfortunately, being an intellectual movement and not a religious one, while it was destructive of shams in religion, it failed to construct anything specially religious in their place. Conybeare, indeed, did, in his *Essay on Church Parties*, describe the normal Broad-Churchman as wishing to revive "daily services, frequent communions, memorials of our Christian calling presented to our notice in crosses and wayside oratories, commemorations to holy men of all times and countries."* Only, unfortunately, Broad-Churchmen do not seem to have got beyond the wish. We should like to know what Broad-Churchman ever erected a cross or wayside chapel on his estate, or started a daily service or a weekly communion in his church.

And what sort of a front did the Low-Church party present to the new school of opinion, at once so popular and so dangerous? The Rev. T. R. Birks wrote a work, entitled *The Bible and Modern Thought*, in which he sought to establish the supernatural character of inspiration, prophecy, miracles, the historical truth of various parts of Scripture, and the substantial agreement of Scripture with the conclusions of modern science. Although, however, one Low-Churchman after another might lift

* *Essays*, p. 143. Conybeare is quoting from Dr. Arnold's *Sermons*, Introduction, p. 56.

up his voice against Broad-Church teaching, yet in the main the Low-Church party was well content to let Broad-Churchmen alone. In so far as Broad-Churchmen opposed Tractarianism, Low-Churchmen were at one with them; in so far as they opposed Low-Church ways, Low-Churchmen had not, for the most part, intellect enough to grapple with their teaching. In their reviews of Broad-Church works, they did little else than indicate various points in which Broad-Churchmen had taken the liberty to differ from them.

It is indeed true that an attack upon Broad-Church teaching (if indeed it deserved the name of an attack) was made in 1856, in the person of the Rev. Benjamin Jowett, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, but the result was simply ridiculous and nothing more, as in truth might have been anticipated. The Rev. Charles Portales Golightly, who in 1859 was Curate of Marston, near Oxford, joined with Dr. Macbride, Principal of Magdalen Hall (both of these being pronounced Low-Churchmen), in requesting the Vice-Chancellor to ascertain from Professor Jowett whether he was prepared to renew his subscription to the XXXIX Articles, and to the three articles of the XXXVIth Canon. This was because the Professor, in his work on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thesalonians, Galatians, and Romans, had made certain statements which appeared to the gentlemen aforesaid open to grave exception. One of these statements was that "not the sacrifice, nor the satisfaction, nor the ransom, but the greatest moral act ever done in this world—the act, too, of One in our

likeness—is the assurance to us that God in Christ is reconciled to the world.”* But another was the simple statement of fact, that the expression used in the Second Article of Religion was not that used in the Epistles of the New Testament. “God,” said Professor Jowett, “is unchangeable: it is we who are reconciled to Him, not He to us.” † (It will, of course, strike the reader that the Professor himself had ignored this in the passage quoted just now.) The two complainants, in bringing up this last statement by the Professor, a statement of simple and undeniable fact, and in grounding thereon in effect a charge of heresy, showed how little able they themselves were to distinguish between principles and persons, and how satisfied they would be with crushing the individual Professor Jowett on any pretence whatsoever. For if the letter of this Article was to be pressed, no one who received the Scriptures as a perfect rule of faith would be able to accept the Article. The expression in the Article is, “Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us.” On the other hand, St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, does not say, “God was in Christ reconciling Himself unto the world,” but “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.” ‡ And similarly to the Colossians, not “having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile Himself unto all things,” but “by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself.” § Now, as it

* *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians &c.*, vol. ii. p. 481.

† *Ib.* p. 152.

‡ 2 Corinthians, v. 19.

§ Colossians i. 20.

was impossible to suppose that in imposing the second Article the Church meant to contradict, and to make others contradict, the clear statements of Scripture, it would follow of necessity that the Church meant to assert, in the passage in question, no more than that a reconciliation between God and us was an object of Christ's Passion and Death ; and not to define exactly which party was to be in any sense the reconciled one.

Therefore the complainants might advantageously, we think, have forborne to say anything about the contrast drawn by Professor Jowett between the expression found in the Articles and those found in the New Testament. The other passage which they cited from the Professor's works might have been deemed to furnish sufficient ground for proceedings in an ecclesiastical court ; but as things were, all that was done was to request that the Professor might be called upon to renew his subscription to the XXXIX Articles, and to the three Articles specified in the Canon ; as if, supposing him to be already holding his Professorship on false pretences, he would have refused to do such a trivial act as writing his name at the bottom of a paper. The Vice-Chancellor, however, concurred with the two Low-Church complainants in thinking their proposal reasonable ; and on a fitting public occasion he called upon the Professor to renew his subscription accordingly. " Give me a pen ! " said the Professor. A pen was handed to him, he wrote his name in the proper place for signatures, and Dr. Macbride and the Rev. Charles Portales Golightly were stultified.

In 1860 the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, was appointed by the Crown, Lord Palmerston being then Premier, to the incumbency of St. Peter's, Vere Street, in the parish of St. Marylebone. Mr. Maurice had already been ejected from the professorship of Divinity at King's College, London, on the grounds of a disbelief of the endlessness of future punishment. At this new appointment the zeal of the *Record* was stirred, and the Editor called upon everybody to bear a hand in preventing the impending mischief. A memorial was in consequence got up calling upon the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) to refuse institution. It was, however, signed by no more than twenty Low-Church clergymen, not one of whom had any eminence in the Low-Church party; and after the appointment was definitely settled, an address congratulating Mr. Maurice thereupon received among other signatures that of the Rev. John James Stewart Perowne, Examining Chaplain to the Low-Church Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Pelham).

CHAPTER XLIX.

Polemical Period, continued. Publication of *Essays and Reviews*.
Tendency of that Work. Proceedings against Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson.

“Lo, they have rejected the word of the LORD; and what wisdom is in them?”—JEREMIAH, viii. 9.

“Facilius malum, cui rationis aliquid affuerit, pro bono habebitur, quam ut bonum ratione desertum non pro malo judicetur.”—TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.* i. 22.

A GREATER outburst, however, of Broad-Church opinions than had yet taken place was the publication in 1860 of a volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*. This work consisted of seven articles, written, the public was told, in entire independence of one another; and it professed to be an attempt at illustrating the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth from a free handling, in what the publishers called a becoming spirit, of the several subjects.

The first article was an essay by Frederick Temple, D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Head Master of Rugby School, and Chaplain to the Earl of Denbigh. The subject was *the Education of the World*. In it the education of the Hebrew nation was divided into three periods—that of Rules, lasting till the time of Christ; that of Example, lasting during the short period of the Lord’s mortal life; and that of Principles, in which the human race is (said the writer) “left to itself, to be guided by the teaching of the Spirit within.”* While, how-

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 6

ever, the Hebrew nation was in its turn educating the world in monotheism and moral purity, Rome, Greece, and Asia were being educated each in its own line. Rome was learning the art of government, the virtue of patriotism, and the fulfilment of political duties in general. Greece was learning the cultivation of the reason and taste. Asia was learning the immortality of the soul and other mysteries. And from these four courses of education mankind was learning the discipline of the conscience, of the will, of the reason and taste, and of the imagination. There might well be some truth in these theories; unfortunately, however, Dr. Temple showed how little he knew of the supernatural as applied to the Christian life, when he spoke of the Church as left to work out *by her natural faculties* the principles of her own action.*

The second article was a review by Rowland Williams, D.D., Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wiltshire, and late Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, Lampeter. This was the same Dr. Williams who had preached such questionable doctrine before the University of Cambridge, that before his course of sermons was over he received a private hint that he had better not finish it; † who, however, when appointed to preach on a subsequent Founder's day, at King's College, that sermon which, according to custom, the University are invited to hear, took for his text the words of St. Paul to Felix, "This I confess unto

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 48.

† Dr. Williams preached at St. Mary's, Cambridge, on the first and second Sundays of Advent, 1854.

thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers ;” * and proceeded thereupon to set forth his own theological views. On his mentioning this afterwards in conversation with a friend, his friend, an orthodox Christian, was said to have replied, “But I say, Williams, why didn’t you *finish the verse* ?” Tradition does not state what reason Dr. Williams alleged in answer ; it may, however, be well surmised to have been that Dr. Williams did not altogether agree with St. Paul in “believing all things that are written in the law and the prophets.”

Dr. Williams’s contribution to *Essays and Reviews* consisted in a review of certain works written by the Chevalier Bunsen, and presenting the reader with certain conclusions of German criticism touching Canonical Scripture. Professing himself an ardent admirer of Bunsen, Dr. Williams proceeded to state these conclusions as triumphantly proved, and to enlarge upon them accordingly for the enlightenment of those unfortunate English people who, not being students of German writings, were still in the dim twilight of orthodox Christianity. Thus, in discussing Egyptian history, he suggested, after Bunsen, that the angel which destroyed the Egyptian first-born may have been the Bedouin host.† The Pentateuch was, indeed, Mosaic in the sense of embodying Moses’ system, but was compiled out of earlier fragments at a time subsequent

* Acts xxiv. 14. The sermon was preached March 25, 1855 ; and was entitled *The Truth and the Book ; or, the Spirit and the Letter*, and published in a volume of sermons entitled *Rational Godliness*, Cambridge and London, 1855.

† *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 70.

to the establishment of the Israelitish monarchy.* The Bible generally was an expression of devout reason.† The Book of Jonah contained a late legend, founded on a misconception.‡ Those portions of Daniel which were supposed to be specially predictive were a history of past occurrences up to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes,§ and while some passages of alleged prophecy might “be doubtful, one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messianic, and a chapter possibly in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem,” “even these few cases” . . . tended to melt, if they “were not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry.” || Psalm xxii. referred to Israel; the Hebrew word rendered in King James’s version “they pierced” was rendered “like a lion.” ¶ Isaiah liii. referred to Jeremiah rather than to any other single person.** What figures in Canonical Scripture as the Second Epistle of St. Peter was dismissed as unquestionably spurious. †† In all this Dr. Williams followed Bunsen with an air of the most triumphant dogmatism; and it was intimated in some metrical lines at the close of the essay that those who taught according to the old-fashioned views, rather than according to the new learning of Chevalier Bunsen and Dr. Williams, were but “hirelings.”

As Dr. Rowland Williams had shown from Baron Bunsen how to get rid of Scripture predictions, so the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S.,

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 71. † *Ib.*

‡ *Ib.* p. 91. § *See ib.* p. 90.

|| *Ib.* p. 82.

¶ *Ib.* p. 81. ** *Ib.* p. 87.

†† *Ib.* p. 100.

late Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford, showed, in an essay on the *Study of the Evidences of Christianity*, how to get rid of Scripture miracles, which he seems to have regarded as the main difficulties and hindrances to the acceptance of Christianity. Proposing to survey in a calm and unprejudiced manner the various opinions and arguments adduced in defending Christianity, and starting from the premiss "that from the nature of our antecedent convictions" with reference to any peculiarly marvellous event "the probability of *some* kind of mistake or deception *somewhere*, though we know not *where*, is greater than the probability of the event really happening *in the way* and from the *causes* assigned,"* he maintained that there was an undue confusion between the force of testimony in regard to human affairs and events in history, on the one hand, and in regard to physical facts, on the other. "The most seemingly improbable events in *human* history may be perfectly credible, on sufficient testimony, however contradicting ordinary experience of human motives and conduct—simply because we cannot assign any limits to the varieties of human dispositions, passions, or tendencies, or the extent to which they may be influenced by circumstances of which, perhaps, we have little or no knowledge to guide us. But no such cases would have the remotest applicability to alleged violations of the laws of *matter*, or interruptions of the course of *physical* causes." †

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 127. † *Ib.* pp. 158-9.

“What is the *real* conclusion” [he asked] “from the far-famed *Historic Doubts* and the *Chronicles of Ecnarf*? But simply this—*there is a rational solution*, a *real* conformity to *analogy and experience*, to whatever extent a partially informed inquirer might be led to reject the recounted apparent wonders on imperfect knowledge, and from too hasty inference; these delightful parodies on Scripture (if they prove anything) would simply prove that the Bible narrative is no more properly *miraculous* than the marvellous exploits of Napoleon I., or the paradoxical events of recent history.”* Looking upon an alleged miracle abstractedly as a physical event and therefore to be referred to physical causes, he concluded that it then ceases to be supernatural: thus begging the whole question. The destructive character of these statements was ill-concealed by the admission that an alleged miracle might be viewed as connected with religious doctrine, and regarded in a sacred light, and which would thus cease to be capable of investigation by reason, but be accepted on religious grounds; † though what Mr. Powell meant to be understood hereby he did not explain. “In nature and from nature” [said he], “by science and by reason, we neither have nor can possibly have any evidence of a *Deity working miracles*: for that we must go out of nature and beyond science. If we could have any such evidence from nature, it could only prove extraordinary *natural* effects, which

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, pp. 165–6.

† *Ib.* p. 170.

would not be miracles in the old theological sense.”* The idea even of creation he was glad to reject,† in favour of “the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature.”‡

The author of the fourth paper was the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Stoughton, Huntingdonshire, and formerly Bampton Lecturer. This was the same Mr. Wilson who, when Fellow and Senior Tutor of St. John’s College, Oxford, had joined three other tutors—Messrs. Churton, Griffiths, and Tait—in requesting the anonymous author of *Tract XC.* to publish his name, on account of what they deemed the dangerous tendency of the said *Tract*; and thus, indirectly, in hounding its author (Mr. Newman) out of the Church of England. Mr. Wilson’s paper was on the *National Church*. It commenced with noticing certain addresses delivered at Geneva “by distinguished persons holding evangelical sentiments,” and entitled *Séances Historiques de Genève*, in two of which the speakers had expressed diverse views as to the true basis of the Church: one asserting the “individualist” principle as such basis, and the other the “multitudinist” principle. Mr. Wilson then proceeded to speak of the Church of England, by which he appears to have meant the aggregate of Christian religionists whose allegiance was due to the British Sovereign; ignoring the nature of Baptism as the sole door of admission into the Church

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 170.

† *Ib.* p. 154.

‡ *Ib.* p. 161.

Catholic or any of its branches. "Each one born into the nation is, together with his civil rights, born into a membership or privilege, as belonging to a spiritual society." * He spoke of large numbers of the more acute of our population as recoiling from certain doctrines preached at church and chapel, as distrusting the old arguments for, or proofs of, a miraculous revelation, and as having misgivings as to the authority, or the extent of the authority, of the Scriptures. † He spoke of grave doubts as arising "in the minds of really well-meaning persons, whether the secular future of humanity is necessarily bound up with the diffusion of Christianity—whether the Church is to be hereafter the life-giver to human society." ‡ And by failing even to hint at any solution of such doubts he implied that he shared in the doubts himself. Asserting "a very widespread alienation, both of educated and uneducated persons, from the Christianity which is ordinarily presented in our churches and chapels," he insinuated that it might be either their reason or their moral sense which was shocked by what they heard there; that is, we suppose, by what they would have heard had they gone thither. § And he made capital of the existence of various associations to procure the revision of the Anglican formularies, especially in "omitting one unhappy creed." || By way of indicating what sort of teaching ought to be given, and from which people

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 233.

† *Ib.* pp. 180-1.

‡ *Ib.* p. 178.

§ *Ib.* pp. 179.

|| *Ib.* p. 180.

would not have reason for recoiling, he hinted that there were “traits in the Scriptural person of Jesus” which were “better explained by referring them to an ideal than an historical origin:” and that there were “parts of Scripture more usefully applied ideologically than in any other manner—as, for instance, the history of the temptation of Jesus by Satan, and accounts of demoniacal possession.’* The references, too, in the New Testament to Old Testament narratives of marvels and catastrophes were said to be made “without either denying or asserting their literal truth—such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire from heaven, and the Noachian Deluge.† Jesus Christ had “not revealed His religion as a theology of the intellect, nor as an historical faith.”‡ “Doctrinal limitations in the multitudinist form of Church” were not essential to the Church’s existence: in other words, you could have a Church without a creed. Doctrinal limitations rather presented obstacles to a true Catholicity.§ “The Gospel was to have sway in doing more perfectly that which heathen religions were doing imperfectly.” What that was the reader was not informed precisely; but, from the close of the same sentence from which we are quoting, it would seem that it was, in Mr. Wilson’s opinion, “to sanctify all social relations and civil institutions, and to enter into the marrow of the national life.|| And thus the Church of England

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 241.

† *Ib.* p. 242.

‡ *Ib.* p. 246.

§ *Ib.* 200.

|| *Ib.* p. 202.

was declared to be "as properly an organ of the national life as a magistracy or a legislative estate:" a statement which would have had truth while the Church and the nation were different names for the same set of individuals, viewed in one or the other of two different aspects; but was, when penned, an utter falsity: as was also the implication that the endowments of the Church were "the real property of the country," and that they had properly been termed "the nationality!"* It was at the same time laid down that "our own Churchmen" should "endeavour to supply to the negative theologian some positive elements in Christianity, on grounds more sure to him than the assumption of an objective faith once delivered to the saints." †

C. W. Goodwin, M.A., followed with an attack on the *Mosaic Cosmogony*. After a brief sketch of some of the principal conclusions at which geologists have arrived with respect to the several stages through which the earth's crust has passed, and the animal and vegetable organisms which have had their being upon it in successive ages, he proceeded to inquire whether those two accounts of creation which we have in the early chapters of Genesis could be shown to be in accordance with our astronomical and geological knowledge. In conducting this inquiry, he noticed the following points in the Mosaic narrative:—That light and the measurement of time are represented as existing before the manifestation of the sun: that the firmament (by which term the Hebrews understood

† *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 231.

¶ *Ib.* 209.

a solid vault) was spoken of as supporting an ocean of water above it: that the earth is described as bringing forth trees and plants destined for food, nothing being said of any others: that on the fourth day the sun and moon are said to have been *made*, and *set* in the firmament, to give light, and to serve for the measurement of time: that the waters are said to have brought forth fishes, other marine animals, and birds; while cattle, reptiles, and wild beasts are said to have been created out of the earth: and that, last of all, man was created “in God’s image and after God’s likeness.” The Hebrews, Mr. Goodwin said, contemplated the Divine Being in the visible form of a man: and to interpret the words “God’s image, God’s likeness” as implying perfection or sinlessness was explaining them away. He noted, moreover, that in the Mosaic narrative all animals were spoken of as herbivorous. And having made these remarks, he further observed that, *prima facie*, the Mosaic account was at variance with modern science. Various explanations of it had been adopted. Dr. Buckland put forth one, Archdeacon Pratt another, and Hugh Miller a third; but all failed in some points. It did not occur to Mr. Goodwin that possibly another explanation might be given which would not fail—an explanation on the view that all after verse 2, and possibly all after verse 1, might refer to a merely local creation, seen in vision, and so described. He was, in short, content to regard the narrative in Genesis as having “mised the world for centuries:”*

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 297.

being, in fact, merely “a human utterance,”* “the speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton, promulgated in all good faith as the best and most probable account that could be then given of God’s universe,”† but in which “the early speculator . . . asserted as facts what he knew in reality only as probabilities.”‡

The sixth paper was an essay on the *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688–1750*. It was by Mark Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. The object was to show what progress was being made by thoughtful people in throwing Divine Revelation overboard altogether. We have seen how Dr. Temple claimed for himself and his readers the liberty of not being bound by the Creeds.§ Mr. Pattison, however, went further, and spoke of “the formulæ of past thinkings in the Church of England” as having “long lost all sense of any kind.”|| Human reason was the ultimate referee in all matters whatsoever; nothing beyond the jurisdiction of reason could be maintained. “The rational defender of the faith . . . proceeds” [said he] “on the supposition that the whole system of the Church is the one and exclusively true expression of reason upon the subject on which it legislates. He claims for the whole of received knowledge what the jurist claims for international law, to be a universal science. He lays before us, on the one hand, the traditional canon or symbol of doctrine. On the other hand, he teaches that the free use of reason upon the

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 305. † *Ib.* pp. 303–4.

‡ *Ib.* p. 304. § See above, p. 122. || *Essays and Reviews*, p. 359.

facts of Nature and Scripture is the real mode by which this traditional symbol is arrived at." * Mr. Pattison did not see that the grounds on which the rational defender of the faith is thus described as proceeding are unsound. It is untrue, in point of fact, that the Creed was formed through the free use of reason upon the facts of Nature or Scripture. It was, in the mouths of those who first uttered it, the expression of what they and their Churches had received by tradition from the first Christian teachers. Ignorant, however, of this, Mr. Pattison proceeded to say that the reason whereof he spoke was the reason of the majority of thinking people : "It is not the speculative reason of the few, but the natural conscience of the many, that questions the extirpation of the Canaanites, or the eternity of hell-torments." † Finally, after the following piece of nonsense had been duly commended to the reason of Mr. Pattison's readers— "Rationalism itself, in order to make the proof of revelation universal, is obliged to resolve religion into the moral government of God by rewards and punishments, and especially the latter ‡"—the general untenableness of the idea of a Divine revelation coming to men from without was not obscurely hinted in the concluding passage : "Whoever would take the religious literature of the present day as a whole, and endeavour to make out clearly on what basis Revelation is supposed by it to rest, whether on Authority, on the Inward Light, on Reason, on self-evidencing Scripture, or

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 365.

† *Ib.* p. 344.

‡ *Ib.* p. 353.

on the combination of the four, or some of them, and in what proportions, would probably find that he had undertaken a perplexing, but not altogether profitless, inquiry."

Professor Jowett, to whom we have already referred, finished the series with an essay on the *Interpretation of Scripture*. In this he hinted at "a difference of opinion respecting Revelation itself—whether given beside the human faculties or through them, whether an interpretation of the laws of nature, or their perfection and fulfilment ;" * as if Revelation was either of these last. He assumed the failure of prophecy in three instances (Jer. xxxvi. 30; Isa xxiii; Amos vii. 10–17), † but without specifying any proof. He spoke of the Sacred Writers as attributing to the Divine Being "actions at variance with that higher revelation which He has given of Himself in the Gospel." ‡ He spoke of "the natural meaning of the words 'This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled'" (Matt. xxiv. 34) as "set aside in favour of others which, however improbable," were "more in accordance with preconceived opinions," or seemed "worthy of the Sacred Writers." § He spoke of "the *attempt to adapt* the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the Creeds;" || as if there had been any inconsistency between the two. "The Nicene or Athanasian Creed" was "unfitted to be the medium by the help of which Scripture" was "to be explained." ¶ Indeed, it was implied that

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 400.

† *Ib.* p. 414.

‡ *Ib.* p. 420.

§ *Ib.* p. 426.

|| *Ib.* 427.

¶ *Ib.* p. 428.

“the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity” was contradicted by the assertion of the Lord that He did not know the day or hour of His Second Advent.*

It was further implied that to interpret John iii. 5 in reference to Baptism, and John vi. 56 in reference to the Holy Communion, might possibly be erroneous: † for it was laid down that the use of Scriptural language respecting the Sacraments had had a reflex influence on the interpretation of those same passages. (Laid down, we say: there was no allegation of any proof.) And the orthodox interpretation of such passages as speak of our Lord’s being tempted, of His prayers to His Father, of His not knowing the hour of His Second Advent, were spoken of as our “perversions of the meanings of words.” ‡

Speaking of the maxims given in Scripture for the regulation and guidance of practice, the Professor asked again whether such maxims were “to be modified by experience, or acted upon in defiance of experience;” § as if there were no other alternative.

The declaration of St. Paul, “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,” “and the corresponding passage in Romans v. 12,” were declared to be figurative. || And as to the declaration, “We which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air,” the Professor implied

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 443.

† *Ib.* pp. 429-431.

§ *Ib.* p. 432.

‡ *Ib.* p. 446.

|| *Ib.* p. 437

that it need not be so understood as to be verified literally.* Where the Lord speaks of the blessedness of poverty, and the hardness which they that have riches will experience in attaining eternal life—to take such sayings literally would be injurious to ourselves and society.† The precepts about divorce were declared to be practically impossible of fulfilment.‡

By little and little the Professor passed into libelling Christian teachers in general; for interpreting sudden calamities in a different way from that inculcated by the Lord when alluding to the fall of the tower in Siloam; for neglecting to observe that the good Samaritan in the parable was of a different religion from that professed by the man whom he succoured; and for maintaining that the precept not to forbid the man to cast out demons, while he failed to follow with the Apostles, had no application for the present time.§ And it was further implied that Christian teachers forbade their hearers to learn about the Bible all which was to be learnt. And Christian ministers were told that they could give no true answer to the mechanic or artisan who might urge “the objections of critics,” for that they themselves were unable to look at things as they truly were!||

Having unsettled the faith of his readers, the Professor proceeded to lay down, on his own authority, that Scripture was to be interpreted like any other book; and by way of explaining what

* *Essays and Reviews*, near the end of § 4.

† *Ib.* p. 438.

‡ *Ib.* p. 441.

§ *Ib.* p. 442.

|| *Ib.* p. 453.

he meant, he laid down “that Scripture has but one meaning—the meaning which it had to the mind of the prophet or evangelist who first uttered or wrote, to the hearers or readers who received it.”* And this one meaning was to be gathered from itself not only “without reference to the adaptations of Fathers or divines,” but also “without regard to *a priori* notions about its nature and origin.”† The mystical methods of applying Scripture were dismissed as unworthy of educated people; and this contempt was shown not only for Scripture language but for Scripture type, including the details of the Mosaic ritual, although those details are described in the Epistle to the Hebrews as being a shadow of good things to come. Neither was there any ground for assuming design of any kind in Scripture any more than in Plato or Homer, save where the meaning of prophetic symbols was derived from some natural association, or borrowed in a later prophecy from an earlier.‡ The mode of interpretation which Professor Jowett advocated was one which should recognise in Scripture a distinction between the ideal and the actual; which deemed “the image of God in Christ” to be set “over against the necessities of human nature and the state of man on earth.” “Our Lord Himself,” said he, “recognises this distinction when He says, ‘Of whom do the kings of the earth gather tribute?’ and ‘then are the children free’ (Matt. xvii. 26). And again, ‘Notwithstanding lest we should offend them,’ &c.” But he gave no

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 459.

† *Ib.* p. 490.

‡ *Ib.* p. 463.

clue as to the grounds on which so strange an interpretation proceeded.*

It will be seen from the above notice that the mischievous tendency of the *Essays and Reviews* was manifold. It was not, indeed, so much the denial of specific Christian doctrines—as, for instance, those of the Trinity, the Hypostatic Union, sacramental grace, the supernatural character of the Church's calling, standing, and life, and of the commission and authority possessed by her ministers; these, if touched upon, were for the most part dismissed as mere speculations or superstitions. Rather, however, the mischief was done by the undermining, by implication or insinuation, of faith in Divine revelation, and supernatural working in general. The dangerous character of the principles thus conveyed was felt by High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen alike. The Low-Church Earl of Shaftesbury denounced the volume in a public speech as having been vomited forth from the jaws of hell. And two suits were commenced in the ecclesiastical courts—the one by the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Hamilton) against Dr. Rowland Williams, who was beneficed in the Sarum diocese, and the other by the Rev.

* We should have thought that the Lord's argument was sufficiently plain. It is grounded on the analogy between the practice of earthly kings and that of the King of the Universe. Earthly kings do not take taxes of their own sons, but of other people's sons: in like manner, the Son of God (as St. Peter had lately owned the Lord to be) should be deemed exempt from paying taxes to His Father in heaven. But lest the making such a claim should lead others to take excuse from paying that tribute to which they were morally as well as lawfully bound, and so to sin, the Lord would not insist upon His rights, but waived them, and wrought a miracle rather than leave the tribute unpaid.

James Fendall, Rector of Harlton and Vicar of Comberton, Cambridgeshire, against the Rev. H. B. Wilson; both these last-named gentlemen being beneficed in the Diocese of Ely. The proceedings were for statements, in their respective essays, alleged to be inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England.

In each case, unfortunately, the prosecution took up ground which was questionable, and failed to take up what was unquestionable. The defendants were charged with publishing opinions which, however erroneous, were in many cases matters of bad or imperfect criticism rather than of heresy. Mr. Wilson, for instance, had pointed out how, in his opinion, subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles might be understood. He might have been mistaken herein; but it was wrong to prosecute him for saying that he meant his own subscription to be taken in such and such a sense, and deemed that sense to be neither improper nor illegal. Alluding, too, to the accounts given in Scripture of Balaam's ass speaking with man's voice—of witches, and a variety of apparitions—of the translation of Elijah—of the nature of angels—of the reality of demoniacal possession—of the personality of Satan—he had pointed out that certain views of Scripture, according to which these narratives were treated as allegorical, or otherwise as unhistorical,* were consistent with the Sixth Article: and so, in our opinion, they were, however erroneous in themselves. But they were in some cases clearly inconsistent with a profession made by every deacon

* *Essays and Reviews*, p 241.

of the Church of England at his ordination, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?—*Answer*: I do believe them." And when Mr. Wilson spoke of "one *unhappy* creed," * and of "doctrinal limitations" (i.e. creeds) as being obstacles to a true Catholicity, † this might well have been complained of as a depravation of the Creeds. It passed, however, without specific complaint. Mr. Rowland Williams, in like manner, had many things laid to his charge, only a few whereof could reasonably be deemed ecclesiastical offences in the uttering. Such offences were, his intimating that the angel who destroyed the firstborn of the Egyptians might have been an army of Bedouins; and that Abraham was bidden to slay his son under the fierce ritual of Syria. So also when Dr. Williams spoke of the Bible as being an expression of devout reason. Against Professor Jowett no one dared take any proceedings; though he would, we think, have been unable to show that such passages as some which we have quoted above were not formal depravations of the Creeds and contradictory to the Eighth Article of Religion. The like may be said of Mr. Pattison.

On the 25th of June, 1862, Dr. Lushington, Dean of the Arches, gave judgment on both suits. In forming it, he professed to have made no account of the opinions either of living prelates on the bench, or of the most learned and orthodox Anglican divines; but to have looked, as he said he would look in all cases of doctrine, "first to the

* *Essays and Reviews*, p. 180.

† *Ib.* p. 200.

Articles, then to the Book of Common Prayer ; and that he accounted it his business merely to ascertain the true construction of the Articles and other formularies according to strict legal principles. Unfortunately, in interpreting the passage cited above from the Ordering of Deacons, the interpretation which he gave as the minimum of strictness admissible was only this:—"a *bonâ fide* belief that the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation, and that to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty." Certain passages, however, both in Dr. Williams's essay, and also in that of Mr. Wilson, were deemed by him inconsistent with the Anglican formularies, and sentence was given accordingly.

Appeal was made in each case to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The Committee was, in the opinion of Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford, "evidently packed for the purpose" of reversing Dr. Lushington's judgment, "no one who ever sat on such questions having been put upon it."* And judgment was given by the Lord Chancellor on the 8th of February, 1864, to the effect that the appellants had not contradicted in terms the words of Scripture or of the Articles ; and on this ground the Court reversed the judgment of the Court of Arches. On this the *Christian Observer* remarked : "We are suffering a grievous wrong ; and redress from our ecclesiastical courts, as at present constituted, is, it seems, so dilatory, so difficult, and so uncertain, that it may almost be said to be unattainable. We are not advocating a return to

* *Life of Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown*, vol. ii. p. 167.

Star Chambers or Courts of High Commission; but some tribunal we do seem to want in which justice may be done without enormous expense or unreasonable delay." * This line, however, was not taken by Low-Churchmen in general. On the 4th of December, 1864, Mr. Keble dictated a letter to the Bishop of Capetown (Dr. Gray) in these terms:—"As to the *Essay and Review* grievance, there had been delay through an endeavour to secure the co-operation of the Low-Churchmen, but they are naturally afraid of damaging the Gorham judgment, and so hang back for the present." † The Editor of the *Christian Observer* itself was unwilling to have the Court of Final Appeal altered, even after the decision in the matter of the *Essays and Reviews*. ‡ As for Mr. Venn, the Secretary of the "Church Missionary Society," he wrote to his brother in March 1861: "I have not been able to join all my friends in their protests against the *Essays and Reviews*, simply because I could not join in a protest with Pusey, Denison, &c. Surely a joint signature implies that the difference between the signers is as nothing compared with the difference between the other party and themselves. This I cannot allow. Besides which, do we and the Tractarians mean the same thing by 'the inspiration of Scripture?' I think not. I find, however, no one who takes the same view as myself, so it is a comfort to explain my singularity to you." §

* *Christian Observer* for 1864, p. 240.

† *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. p. 176.

‡ *Christian Observer* for 1865, p. 208.

§ *Knight's Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn*, pp. 329, 330.

CHAPTER I.

Polemical Period, continued. Bishop Colenso of Natal. His Heretical Publications. Proceedings with regard to him. Line taken by the Low-Church Party.

“A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject.”—TITUS iii. 10.

THE *Essays and Reviews*, however, were speedily thrown into the shade by the publication of two works by John William Colenso, D.D., Lord Bishop of Natal, in South Africa.

The commencement of the South African Episcopate of the Anglican Communion was the consecration of Dr. Robert Gray to the See of Capetown. When Bishop Gray first went out, he had episcopal jurisdiction in all the English colonies in South Africa. Such a charge was obviously too great for one individual; and Bishop Gray felt this, and before he departed to his rest he had the comfort of seeing his vast diocese divided, and two other dioceses formed out of it, Grahamstown and Natal, besides a bishopric formed for the Orange River Free State. And it was owing in great measure to his influence that Dr. Colenso was consecrated first Bishop of Natal. At that time the ecclesiastical territory in South Africa was constituted a province, with Capetown for its metropolitan see: and Dr. Colenso, at his consecration, took the following oath:—“In the name of God, Amen. I, John William, chosen Bishop of the Church and See of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Bishop and to the Metropolitan

Church of Capetown, and to their successors: So help me God, through Jesus Christ." The events now to be narrated happened for the most part in Africa, but the narration of them falls within the scope of the present work, inasmuch as the force of them was felt throughout the Anglican Communion; and we shall be concerned to mark what line with respect to them was taken by the Low-Church party in England.

In June 1861 the Bishop of Natal published a new translation and exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: which occasioned the Bishop of Capetown to ask the Archbishop of Canterbury by letter (November 12) whether the Bishop's teaching was so erroneous that the Church ought to rid herself of the guilt of sharing it; if so, then in what way—whether by synodical condemnation, or trial, or in some other way. And in May 1862 many English bishops met together for the purpose of considering these questions.

Meanwhile the Bishop of Natal had printed and circulated privately the First Part of another work, viz. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, Critically Examined*: and was following his metropolitan to England with the intention of publishing it there. It was published in October following, and at once raised a great consternation. Preparation had been made for the promulgation of the Bishop's opinions by a note in the *Essays and Reviews*, where Mr. Bristow Wilson had written, "Previous to the time of the divided kingdom the Jewish history presents little which is thoroughly reliable. The taking of Jerusalem by 'Shishak' is for the

Hebrew history that which the sacking of Rome by the Gauls is for the Roman. And from no facts ascertainable is it possible to infer there was an early period during which the government by the priesthood was attended with success. Indeed the greater probability seems on the side of the supposition that the priesthood, with its distinct offices and charges, was constituted by royalty; and that the higher pretensions of the priests were not advanced till the reign of Josiah. . . Samuel, however, with whose government the Israelites were dissatisfied, was not a priest, but a prophet; and the whole of that part of the narrative is conceived in the prophetic, not in the priestly interests."* And now a bishop of the Anglican Communion rushed into print to show not only "that the Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or by anyone acquainted personally with the facts which it professes to describe," but also "that the (so-called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, cannot be regarded as historically true." In January 1863 was published the Second Part; and the Third Part later on in the same year.

On the 4th of February was held a large meeting of bishops at Queen Anne's Bounty Office. It was attended by the Archbishops of Canterbury (Dr. Longley), York (Dr. Thomson), and Armagh (Lord John George Beresford); by the Bishops of London (Dr. Tait), Durham (Dr. Baring), Winchester (Dr. Sumner), Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce), Bangor (Dr. Campbell), Lincoln (Dr. Jackson),

* *Essays and Reviews*, 12th edition, p. 203, note.

Worcester (Dr. Philpott), Llandaff (Dr. Ollivant), Carlisle (Dr. Waldegrave), Rochester (Dr. Wigram), Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott), Manchester (Dr. Prince Lee), Chichester (Dr. Gilbert), Exeter (Dr. Philpotts), St. Asaph (Dr. Short), Chester (Dr. Graham), Salisbury (Dr. Hamilton), St. Davids (Dr. Thirlwall), Bath and Wells (Lord Auckland), Sodor and Man (Dr. Powis); also by Bishop Hampden of Hereford, and the Bishops of Derry (Dr. Higgins), Down (Dr. Knox), Montreal (Dr. Fulford), and Tasmania (Dr. Nixon). The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had asked advice from the Archbishop of Canterbury as to their duty in regard of the Bishop of Natal: whether they ought to elect him again as one of their Vice-Presidents, and whether he ought to be permitted to administer the funds of the Society. And the Archbishop now asked counsel of his brethren: should he give any advice at all to the Society?

The Bishop of Winchester wanted to know whether any legal proceedings were to be taken. He would inhibit the Bishop of Natal from officiating in the Diocese of Winchester, even if legal proceedings were taken as well. The Bishop of Durham thought that they ought not to wait for legal proceedings. The Bishop of Chichester deemed that he for his part must certainly inhibit the Bishop of Natal.

Then a resolution was proposed by the Bishop of Oxford, stating that the Bishops who signed it agreed to inhibit the Bishop of Natal from officiating in their several dioceses. It was supported by the Bishop of Llandaff, but opposed by the Archbishop of York.

The Bishop of Manchester said that he wished for a declaration, not an inhibition of the Bishop of Natal. The Bishop of Rochester said that he had inhibited the Bishop of Natal already. Finally, however, the resolution proposed by the Bishop of Oxford was carried by twenty-five votes against four; the four dissentients being the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of London, St. David's, and Manchester.

It was also agreed to appoint a committee for preparing a document which all might sign. A few days latter, the document was prepared in the form of a letter to the Bishop of Natal; which, being read, was adopted, and signed by forty-one bishops, the only dissentient being the Bishop of St. David's. In this letter the Bishop of Natal was called upon to resign his office, on the ground that he had professed himself unable to believe any longer what he had professed to believe before, such profession of belief having been an indispensable condition of admission to his office. Other grounds alleged for the Bishop's resignation were, his having declared himself unable to use the offices for ordination and baptism as prescribed by the Church.

And on the 11th of February a motion was brought forward in the Lower House of Convocation by Archdeacon Denison, seconded by the Low-Churchman Dr. M'Caul (of Hebraistic fame), and carried, "That the standing orders be postponed in order to the moving of an address praying the Upper House to direct the appointment of a committee to examine Bishop Colenso's book on the

Pentateuch, and to report whether any, and if so, what, opinions, heretical or erroneous in doctrine, it contained.”

So much for the line taken by Church authorities at home, Low-Churchmen included. We must now turn our attention to Africa.

In May the Dean of Capetown, the Very Rev. Henry Alexander Douglas (afterwards Bishop of Bombay), the Archdeacon of Grahamstown (the Ven. Nathanael James Merriman, afterwards Bishop of Grahamstown), and the Archdeacon of George (the Ven. Hopkins Badnall), signed a Presentment of the Bishop of Natal, and addressed it to the Metropolitan, Bishop Gray of Capetown; who thereupon cited the Bishop of Natal to appear before him in the Cathedral at Capetown and answer to the charges contained in the Presentment. Those charges were expressed in the following terms, each charge being preceded by extracts from one or more of Bishop Colenso's published works, and extracts from, or references to, authorised formularies of the Anglican Communion, which Bishop Colenso was alleged to have contravened :—

That in the extracts contained in Schedule I., the writer, maintaining that our blessed Lord did not die in man's stead, or bear the punishment or penalty of our sins, and that God is not reconciled to us by the death of His Son, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule II., the writer, maintaining that justification is a *consciousness* of being counted righteous, and that all

men, even without such consciousness, are treated by God as righteous, and counted righteous, and that all men, as members of the great human family, are dead unto sin and risen again unto righteousness, denies that men are justified by faith, and impugns and contradicts the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule III., the writer, maintaining that all men have the new birth unto righteousness in their very birth-hour, that is to say, are regenerate when born into the world, as members of the great human family; and also that all men are at all times partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, denies that the holy Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, and that they convey any special grace, and further denies that faith is the means whereby the Body and Blood of Christ is [*sic*] received and eaten, and that faith is necessary in order that the grace bestowed by God in sacraments may have a wholesome effect and operation, and therefore impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule IV., the writer, maintaining that he cannot any longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishment, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule V., the writer, maintaining that the Holy Scriptures *contain* the Word of God, but are not the Word of God, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith

as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule VI., the Holy Scriptures are spoken of and treated as a merely human book, not inspired by God the Holy Spirit, or inspired only in such a manner as other books may be inspired, and that so to speak and treat of the Holy Scriptures is to impugn and contradict the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule VII., the authenticity, genuineness, and truth of certain books of Holy Scripture in whole or in part are denied; and that by this denial, the authority and canonicity of these books in whole or in part are called in question, and denied in contravention of the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

That in the extracts contained in Schedule VIII., the writer maintaining that our Blessed Lord was ignorant and in error upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch, denies the doctrine that our Blessed Lord is God and man in one person, and by this denial impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, &c., above set forth and referred to.

The charge preferred under the extracts in Schedule IX. was fully set forth in a letter, addressed to the Metropolitan, which was annexed to the Presentment, and of which the following passage contains the charge in question:—"With respect to the extracts contained in the ninth schedule, we charge the Bishop of Natal with depraving, im-

pugning, and otherwise bringing into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and the Baptismal Services, and in so doing with violating the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the 36th of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical.”*

The trial began on the 17th of November, 1863, in St. George's Cathedral, Capetown. The Metropolitan presided, assisted by the Bishops of Grahamstown and Orange River Free State. The three clergymen who had signed the Presentment were present as accusers; and the Bishop of Natal had sent a Dr. Bleek to be present as his personal friend, and to protest against the proceedings. Dr. Bleek was known to be an unbeliever; and when, in the course of the trial, he was formally asked whether he was a member of the Church of England, or of any communion which would recognise its formularies, he declined to answer the question.† The trial was continued on the 18th of November and two following days. On the 21st, as the Bishop of Natal had not appeared, and Dr. Bleek would not go beyond his instructions, which were that he should do no more than protest, the Dean, who was the first in the prosecution, went through, point by point, that letter of the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan which had been read the day before, and which the Court accepted as containing the substance of what the Bishop would have said in his own defence had he appeared.

On the 14th of December the Court sat again to

* *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. pp. 593, &c.

† *Ib.* p. 79.

hear the opinions of the two bishops who had been the Metropolitan's assessors. And on the 16th the Metropolitan himself gave judgment; which was, that the Bishop of Natal, having been convicted of false teaching on many grave and fundamental points, involving a wide and systematic departure from the faith, was unfit, so long as he should persist in those errors, to bear rule in the Church of God, or to exercise any sacred offices whatever therein. In this opinion, said the Metropolitan, and in the sentence which he was about to pass, his assessors entirely agreed. He added that if it was desired to make a formal appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury he would consent to forward his judgment to the Archbishop for revision, waiving in that particular case any real or supposed rights of what he termed "this Church" (meaning, no doubt, either the metropolitanical Church of Capetown, or the whole federation of Anglican churches in South Africa). It would, he felt, be a very great relief to submit his decision to the chief pastor of the Church at home, and to share his responsibilities with him, and, if he should see fit, with the other bishops of the National Church. Then followed the technical sentence by which the Bishop of Natal was deposed from his office, and prohibited from the exercise of any Divine office within any part of the metropolitanical Province of Capetown.

The operation of the sentence was suspended until the 16th of April, 1864; when, if the Bishop had not retracted all the errors of which he had been convicted, it was to be published in all the

churches of the Diocese of Natal, and in the several cathedral churches of the Province of Capetown. No retraction, however, having been made, it was served on Bishop Colenso on the 31st of May. The Bishop petitioned the Queen against it; and his petition was referred to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which sat to hear the arguments on the 14th of December. Sir Hugh Cairns (afterwards Earl Cairns) and the Queen's Advocate appeared for the Metropolitan; stated the Metropolitan's protest against the implied jurisdiction of the Crown in the subject-matter of Bishop Colenso's petition, and against the idea that any appeal lay from his proceedings therein either to the Crown or to the Judicial Committee; and stated also four reasons why Bishop Colenso's appeal should not be allowed; praying, moreover, that their Lordships would pronounce for the protest of the Metropolitan, and against the said pretended complaint and appeal. Judgment was given against the Metropolitan on the 20th of March, 1865; the lords present being the Lord Chancellor (Lord Cranworth), Lord Kingsdown, the Dean of Arches (Dr. Lushington), and the Master of the Rolls (Sir Joseph Romilly).* These learned men decided that the Metropolitan's sentence on Bishop Colenso was "null and void in law."

On the 28th of June, 1865, the bishops of the Province of Canterbury agreed in Convocation to an address to the President, asking him to convey to the Bishop of Capetown and the bishops who sat with him to try Bishop Colenso the expression of

* *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. Appendix VIII.

their “ hearty admiration of the courage, firmness, and devoted love of the truth of the Gospel as this Church has received the same, which has [said they] been manifested by him and them under most difficult and trying circumstances. We thank them [the Bishops continued] for the noble stand they have made against heretical and false doctrine,” &c.* This was proposed by the Bishop of Oxford, seconded by the Bishop of Llandaff, and carried. Being brought before the Lower House of Convocation, it was opposed by Dean Stanley and Sir Henry Thompson.

The deposed bishop returned to the Diocese of Natal, and on Sunday, the 17th of November, 1865, said Mattins and Litany, and preached a sermon in the Cathedral of Maritzburg, in spite of the protests of the Dean and churchwardens.

Meanwhile the Metropolitan had held a Provincial Synod of bishops, which resolved unanimously † that in the event of Bishop Colenso’s presuming to exercise episcopal functions in the Diocese of Natal after the Metropolitan’s sentence should have been notified to him, and in case of his declining to appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of his not being restored by his Metropolitan, he would be *ipso facto* excommunicate; and that it would be the Metropolitan’s duty, in such a contingency, and after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence of excommunication.‡ And in fulfilment of this resolution, the sentence was passed under the Metropolitan’s hand and seal on the 16th of

* *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. pp. 212, 213.

§ *Ib.* pp. 240, 255.

† *Ib.* p. 240.

December, and published by the Dean of Maritzburg in Maritzburg Cathedral on Sunday, the 7th* of January, 1866.

In the Convocation of Canterbury the Archbishop, on the 2nd of May in the same year, proposed three questions: one from the Bishop of Capetown, whether the Church of England was in communion with Bishop Colenso or with the bishops who had excommunicated him; and two from the Dean of Maritzburg, viz. whether the acceptance of a new bishop on the part of the Diocese of Natal while Dr. Colenso retained his letters patent would in any way sever the diocese from the Church of England; and, in the event of a negative answer, what were the proper steps for them to take for obtaining a new bishop.

In the course of a warm debate which then ensued, and which was resumed the next day, the Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Jeune) said that he did not think it needful for the Convocation to say to the Colonial Church, "Consecrate a bishop for Natal," though he was by no means prepared to say it might not be their duty so to do. In reply to the first question of the three, the Upper House gave no answer to the former part of it, but answered the latter part affirmatively. With regard to the second question, it was resolved that the existence of the letters patent would not cause the acceptance of a new bishop by the diocese to involve any loss of communion with the Church of England. And with regard to the third, it was

* Bishop Gray's son and biographer says, "Sunday, January 5." But the 5th of January in that year was *Friday*.

resolved that if the consecration of a new bishop should be determined, a formal instrument declaring the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa should be prepared, and that every bishop, priest and deacon appointed to office in that Church should be required to subscribe it; that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the clergy with the assent of the lay-communicants of the Church; and then that he should be presented for consecration either to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or else to the bishops of South Africa. After years of wearisome delay, this expression of opinion was carried into effect in the consecration of William Kenneth Macrorie, Perpetual Curate of Accrington, Lancashire, to fill the vacant pastorate. This was done in the Cathedral of Capetown, by the Metropolitan, assisted by the Bishops of Grahamstown, St. Helena, and Orange River Free State, on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1869.

And how were the proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown regarded by the Low-Church party at home? In ancient times no orthodox bishop, no orthodox Christian, would have hesitated. The refusal of the Convocation of Canterbury to pronounce whether the Church of England was or was not in communion with Bishop Colenso arose, probably, from the fact that the Church of England was theoretically one with the English State, and from a fear on the part of the bishops of being committed, as they might be, for aught that they knew, to a course which might make against the constitution of the country. How far such a fear

was excusable in men who in their baptism had renounced the vain pomp and glory of the world, so that they would not follow nor be led thereby, is a question on which it does not behove us to pass judgment. We only remark that such a fear as we have mentioned was probably felt, and led, probably, to the conclusion mentioned above. And it is likely that the same feeling influenced the Low-Church party in general, which had always had some leaning towards Erastianism, and whose Church principles consisted mainly in the admission that the establishment of religion was obligatory on a Christian state, and that whatever was ordered by the civil ruler, and not forbidden in Canonical Scripture, might lawfully be done by members of the Church.

Over and above this, however, the Low-Church party had reasons of their own for standing aloof from Bishop Gray and those who sympathised with him, even though they did not hold at all with Bishop Colenso. The action of the Church in South Africa had proceeded on the principle of the innate spiritual authority of the episcopate, irrespective of recognition by civil rulers : and upon such spiritual pretensions a Low-Churchman looked with suspicion, if not with absolute reprobation, and could not see any difference between what was done in the nineteenth century by Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown, and what had been done in the eleventh by Hildebrand, Bishop of Rome. Thus, when the Pan-Anglican Conference presumed, said the *Christian Observer*, “to deprive him [Bishop Colenso] of all the spiritual authority that belongs to his office, to close his diocese against him, and

to urge his clergy . . . not only to refuse him canonical obedience, but, as far as they can, to deny him the use of their pulpits,"* this was but a manifestation of "priestly arrogance:" and why? Because "the law says he is still the legal Bishop of Natal!"† And on the consecration of Dr. Macrorie as Bishop of Maritzburg, the *Christian Observer* remarked: "As true members of the Church of this realm as by law established, we cannot otherwise characterise the proceeding than as a deliberate act of schism." Bishop Gray ought, according to the Editor, to have cited the Bishop of Natal before the Queen on a charge of his grievous heresy as being a violation of the fundamental principles of the letters patent, as a reason for their being cancelled; this course having been deemed open, according to the judgment of Lord Romilly.‡ Nor was this all. The grounds on which Bishop Colenso had been condemned were not only his denial of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, of justification by faith, of the Bible as being the Word of God, and of its writers as having been specially inspired by God the Holy Ghost, but also his implicit denial of sacramental grace. Bishop Colenso's accusers had charged him with denying that the Sacraments convey any special grace. The doctrine that the Sacraments do convey such grace, or, in other words, that grace is bestowed by God in them, had been taught by the rulers of the Church in South Africa from the first, and therefore, as Bishop Gray wrote in 1863, the *Record* and its admirers had cast

* *Christian Observer* for 1868, p. 207.

† *Ib.* p. 206.

‡ *Ib.* for 1869.

out the names of them and of their clergy for evil during many years.* And so the proceedings of Bishop Gray were regarded (and perhaps truly) as violating every Protestant principle; and the condemnation of heresy on those points whereon Bishop Colenso was heretical was deemed only a secondary matter.† And the fact that Bishop Gray and his comprovincials had fought for some doctrines which Low-Church people held was no reason why Low-Church people should approve of their fighting, in the same battle, for other doctrines which Low-Church people in general practically denied. Thus it was that in November 1867 Bishop Gray came to write: “Though I have been called to defend the chief matters which Evangelicals pride themselves on maintaining more than others—*e.g.* the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrines of original sin, the sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross as an expiation for sin, justification by faith, &c.—that school not only stands aloof and renders me no support, but even strives to induce others to do so. It was only the other day that I was told that a party of clergy of this school met together and denounced one of their number who had expressed his intention of being present at a sermon and meeting of mine.”‡ And the Editor of the *Christian Observer* remarked that although Dr. Colenso was unfit to be a bishop, yet it was doubtful whether the Bishop of Capetown had any right to supersede him: “and we are not to do evil that good may come.” §

* *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. p. 63.

† *Christian Observer* for 1868, p. 209.

‡ *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. pp. 368, 369.

§ *Christian Observer* for 1865, p. 79.

To do the Low-Church party justice, however, several of their bishops gave Bishop Gray their warm support; at least as much as High-Churchmen. Mr. Keble, writing to the Bishop of Capetown on Low Sunday 1864, speaks of a "sort of coalition" between him and other High-Churchmen on the one hand, and Low-Churchmen on the other, against Bishop Colenso's opinions. And in another letter, dated June 4, he speaks of "nearly 12,000 clergy" who had "publicly disavowed and branded the heresies:" which number must have included several thousand Low-Churchmen. In July 1868 the Bishop of Llandaff (Dr. Ollivant), in discussing the question of the report of a committee of bishops appointed by Convocation to consider Bishop Colenso's deposition, made a learned disquisition against the Erastianism of the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait), and ended "by affirming that it was not possible 'to come to any other conclusion than that the Bishop of Capetown did everything that was essential to the justice of the case,'" and moved accordingly the adoption of the report. Bishop Campbell also, of Bangor, supported the adoption of the report.* As for the insulting conduct shown by the Archbishop of York towards his brother metropolitan in refusing to receive the intimation sent him by the latter of Dr. Macrorie's consecration, † that is probably to be explained rather on

* *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. pp. 428. &c.

† On the 17th of June, 1869, the Bishop of Capetown wrote: "York has sent back my letter to him communicating Macrorie's consecration, and requesting him to communicate the fact to the Bishops of his province. It has come to me with 'refused' on the outside!!!"—*Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. pp. 474-5.

the ground of the Archbishop's intense Erastianism than on the grounds of anything else. There were, and probably there still are, persons with whom devotion to the civil power is the supreme habit of religion: to whom the precept "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" eclipses every other; as when the chief priests of the Jews declared, "We have no king but Cæsar."* The Editor of the *Record* rejoiced when, Dean Williams of Grahamstown having joined the Colenso party, and taken with him the cathedral property, and Bishop Merriman having appealed from the colonial court to the Privy Council, sentence was given against him in July 1882. The grounds of the joy appear to have been the consideration pointed out by the Judicial Committee, that the reservation of rights made by the Church of South Africa "would tend to silence and to exclude those whom the decisions of her Majesty in Council would protect in the Church of England,"† but who, tested fairly by the authorised standards, would have in justice to be silenced and excluded.

It may be well to remark here that when, after the death of Bishop Colenso, his party in South Africa sought to get a new bishop in succession to him, and irrespectively of the Metropolitan and Church of South Africa, the prelates to whom they applied were, besides the two English archbishops, and the Bishops of London (Dr. Temple) and Worcester (Dr. Philpott), the Bishops of Manchester (Dr. Fraser) and Liverpool (Dr. Ryle). Dr. Temple, it will be remembered, had written the first of the

* John xix. 15.

† *Record*, July 7, 1882.

Essays and Reviews, and Dr. Philpott had expressed sympathy with the Colenso party, wishing God-speed to a clergyman who was going out to join them. As for Dr. Fraser and Dr. Ryle, they were two of the Lowest Churchmen on the bench: and their proceedings in the interests of the Low-Church party will be seen further on.

CHAPTER LI.

Polemical Period, continued. Opposition at Oxford to Woodard Schools. Rev. J. W. Cunningham. Opposition to a Scheme for Missionary Bishops. Low-Churchmen hissed at a Church Congress. London College of Divinity. Rev. Dr. Marsh. Rev. H. V. Elliott. Rev. Hugh Stowell.

WE now return to our general narrative. In November 1861 a public meeting was held at Oxford, in the Sheldonian Theatre, to promote the establishment of cheap public schools for the lower middle class, on the plan formed by Canon Woodard, by which the distinctive Anglican character of the religious teaching, and of the system in general, was to be kept up. While the meeting was assembling, an anonymous paper was circulated making these allegations:—"1. Confession is encouraged among the boys at these schools. Many influential clergy in the neighbourhood withhold their support from the schools on this account. 2. Crucifixes are distributed among the boys on leaving these schools." Considering that the Church of England contemplates the use of confession wherever the conscience is burdened with sin, and considering that the possession of a crucifix is not

a sin at all, we should have thought that to make these alleged facts grounds of opposing Canon Woodard's scheme was rather out of place in members of the Church of England: it would surely have been enough for each Protestant parent to abstain from contributing to the establishment of one of the schools, and from sending his own son to any. The *Christian Observer*, however, thought otherwise, and braved "the displeasure of the Sheldon Theatre, and its thousand enthusiastic undergraduates" (fortunately there was no fear of the Theatre or its undergraduates troubling themselves about the *Christian Observer* at all), by telling them "plainly that such an institution" was "unworthy of the countenance of a Protestant University."*

The same year (1861) terminated the mortal career of the Rev. John William Cunningham. Born January 3, 1780, of a pious mother, he attended, while a boy, the preaching of Low-Churchmen; of Basil Woodd generally, and of Romaine and John Newton occasionally. He entered in due time at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became a Fellow of that Society. While at Cambridge, he used to hear Mr. Simeon, and sometimes Robert Hall, the eloquent Anabaptist. In 1802 he was ordained by Bishop North of Winchester to the curacy of Ripley in Surrey; a year afterwards he removed to the sole charge of Ockham, in the same neighbourhood; then to the curacy of Clapham, under the Rev. John Venn, where he soon became a member of "the Clapham Sect" (as Sydney Smith

* *Christian Observer* for 1861, p. 980.

termed it), then flourishing : he having even in his schooldays made the acquaintance of those who were now Sir Robert Grant and Lord Glenelg. In 1811 he became Vicar of Harrow, the presentation to that living having been previously purchased by his family. Nor was he idle here. In the course of his fifty years' incumbency the more distant hamlets of the parish were formed into three district-parishes, the third of which had its church ready for consecration when he died. The mother-church was enlarged and restored ; schools were erected for it and the daughter-parishes, and parochial machinery of various kinds formed and set a-going. He departed to his rest Sept. 30, 1861. He had been Editor of the *Christian Observer* from 1850 to 1858.

In 1862 Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford brought into the House of Lords a bill for the appointment of missionary bishops. It was opposed by the Lord Chancellor Westbury, from a sense of duty ! And with regard to it the *Christian Observer* remarked : "This is not the first attempt of the extreme High Church party to invade the royal prerogative in things spiritual." *

In 1863 was afforded the first positive indication, perhaps, of a decrease in the prestige of the Low Church party ; an indication, however, of a kind which might well have been spared. In the October of that year a Church congress was held at Manchester. At this time Church congresses were not regarded with favour by Low-Churchmen in general. The Rev. J. C. Ryle, the writer of

* *Christian Observer* for 1862, p. 640.

sundry tracts, and known also as a determined maintainer of Low-Church doctrines, had avowed his own intention of keeping aloof from one, on the ground of its High-Church character, the congress movement being supported very largely by High-Churchmen. And on the present occasion Canon Stowell, a noted Low-Church leader, was hissed, and sat down amidst indescribable confusion. Mr. Bardsley also met with similar treatment.

This year, however, was chiefly remarkable for the opening, in the month of September, of the LONDON COLLEGE OF DIVINITY. It had been founded by the Rev. Alfred Peache, Incumbent of Mangotsfield-with-Downend, in Gloucestershire, and Miss Peache, at a cost of upwards of £70,000, for the purpose of "training for the Ministry of the Church of England suitable candidates who have not received a university education: and also for affording systematic theological teaching to graduates." Its fundamental principle was expressed in the following extract from the trust deed:—"The teaching and government shall always be strictly Protestant and Evangelical, in conformity with the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland, as expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles, as now by law established, interpreted according to the plain and natural meaning thereof."

This was the same institution which, three years later, took up its abode in Highbury, in buildings to which was transferred the name of the place where its work was now commenced, viz. St. John's Hall. The object was, as has been seen, to furnish

the Church with Low-Church ministers. It was arranged that the full course of study should occupy three years, and that its students should have the most complete Biblical and theological training, according to the opinions of the college authorities, which their time and previous education would permit in their several cases. And, as the final test on passing out of the college previously to ordination, it was required that the student should present himself at the general preliminary examination of candidates for holy orders, conducted by the Board of University Examiners. This was to serve instead of an examination for a degree, which the college was not authorised to confer. But in order to ensure as far as possible that each student should both be and continue a Low-Churchman, he had, previously to entrance, to satisfy the college examiner not only as to his possessing a sufficient amount of classical or other knowledge, but also as to his apparent "promise of fitness for the ministry."*

The year 1864 witnessed the decease of an eminent Low-Church clergyman, William Marsh, D.D., Honorary Canon of Worcester, and Rector of Beddington in Surrey. He was born in 1775, and was third son of Col. Sir Charles Marsh, who served in India under Lord Clive. "Early in his nineteenth year, one of his acquaintances fell down dead in an assembly-room, in his presence. He went home and passed a sleepless night of deep anxiety as to the safety of his own soul if he had been the one

* *London College of Divinity Calendar for 1884.*

taken and his companion left. Towards morning he fell asleep and dreamt, as was not unnatural after such thoughts and such an event, that the Judgment Day was come, that he saw the Saviour, and that he was carried away from His presence into outer darkness. He awoke in an agony, and found it was a dream. Then he thought he heard a voice from heaven cry, ‘Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.’” * Under these impressions, “he at once set himself to seek Christ as his Saviour from the wrath to come. He began a diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, reading four chapters a day with prayer: and at the same time regularly attending the . . . ministry of the Hon. and Rev. Wm. B. Cadogan, at Reading, until he found . . . joy and peace in believing. . . . Before this the army had been his destination, and a commission had been given him in consequence of his father’s gallant services in India. But now the ministry of the Gospel of Christ had superior attractions, and he resigned his commission without joining his regiment,” † and entered in due time at St. Edmund’s Hall, Oxford.

He was ordained to the curacy of St. Lawrence, Reading, in 1798; which charge he served gratuitously for ten years; being also presented in 1801 to the small livings of Nettlebed, now, it would seem, united in one donative. Later, he was presented to Basildon and Ashampstead. Those, it will be remembered, were the days of pluralism.

* Obituary in *Christian Observer* for 1864, p. 790.

† *Ib.* p. 791.

But it should be mentioned that, either while Curate of St. Lawrence's, or after he left, he paid all the Vicar's debts. In 1813 he took St. James's Proprietary Chapel, Brighton, and remained there nine months, that is, until the decision of a point of law concerning his tenure of the chapel was given against him. He was now presented by Mr. Simeon of Cambridge to the vicarage of St. Peter's, Colchester. And here let us cite the following anecdote from Miss Marsh's biography of him. It appears that a clergyman had published a pamphlet containing various false statements about Mr. Marsh, of which Mr. Marsh had taken no notice. "Shortly afterwards, on some public occasion, the benefactors of the County Hospital were required to walk together in procession. My father was one of them, and the clergyman who was appointed to walk with him was the one who had attacked him. My father had heard his name, but the other did not know that his companion was the man whom he had been persuaded to calumniate. He became so charmed with him in the course of their walk, that at the end of it he said to a friend who resided in the town, 'Tell me who was my delightful companion? He seems to be the *beau idéal* of a Christian and a gentleman.' 'He is the man about whom you have written in no measured terms,' was the reply. The clergyman was hurrying away, when my father hastened after him, took his hand, and expressed his cordial good wishes for him. The other was deeply touched, and at once went to his publisher to buy

up the remaining copies of his pamphlet, that he might commit them to the flames." *

In 1828 or thereabouts he took the district church of St. Thomas's, Birmingham, on the presentation of his friend the Rector of Birmingham, the Rev. Thomas Moseley; who, "living," we are told, on terms of the closest intimacy with "Mr. Marsh, bears this testimony, that a more heavenly-minded man he never knew; that he never, to the best of his recollection, spent a half-hour with him, or received a note from him, which did not breathe of that Kingdom on which his affections were supremely set. And this was the more remarkable because he had evermore a fund of playful wit and pleasantry at his command, which made him very popular with all classes. Such a combination of vivacity and spirituality he never saw in any man." †

Those "were the times of the Reform Bill. Yet Dr. Marsh commanded the respect of all, and the love of very many. Upon some surging meetings where angry passions were abroad, he was expressly called in to pour the oil of his gentleness and sanctity. But those who knew him best loved him most. To his curates he was a father. His house and table was always open to them. So, indeed, it was to all who asked it, perhaps even to a fault. Both at Colchester and Birmingham he was perhaps too prodigal of his time and of his purse to some whom a severer scrutiny would have

* *Life of the Rev. William Marsh, D.D.*, by his daughter, 1867, pp. 102, 103.

† Obituary in *Christian Observer* for 1864, p. 793.

rejected. Every Saturday he had a prayer-meeting with his curates; and every month a clerical meeting for the town and neighbourhood, which he made a great point of attending, and into which he pre-eminently infused a spirit of peace and love. 'He kept us together,' said Mr. Moseley." *

From Birmingham he went, in 1839, to Leamington, where he built a chapel (St. Mary's) mainly at his own cost, and took the incumbency of the same. In 1851 he resigned it, and went to live with his son-in-law, the Rev. F. S. C. Chalmers, Rector of Beckenham, Kent; till, in 1860, he accepted the rectory of Beddington, near Croydon, in Surrey, where he departed to his rest August 25, 1864.

Two more Low-Church leaders followed Dr. Marsh in the year following: the Rev. Henry Venn Elliott and the Rev. Hugh Stowell. The Rev. Henry Venn Elliott was born on the 17th of January, 1792. His mother was Eling, a daughter of Henry Venn the elder, author of *The Complete Duty of Man*. Manliness was a characteristic of his youth. Twice he stopped men fighting in the street, and on one of these occasions he went between the contending parties and said, "If you want to fight, fight me," and then rebuked the bystanders for encouraging the fight. In 1810 he went up to Trinity College, Cambridge; and while still an undergraduate he bore a part in the formation in the University of an auxiliary branch to the British and Foreign Bible Society. He took his degree in January 1814; and in

* Obituary in *Christian Observer* for 1864, p. 793.

October 1816 was elected Fellow of his college. On Sunday, the 2nd of November, 1823, he was ordained deacon by Bishop Sparks of Ely, to the curacy of Ampton, near Bury St. Edmunds, and received priest's orders at Norwich on Trinity Sunday, June 13, 1824, from Bishop Bathurst. He left Ampton in January 1827 for the incumbency of St. Mary's Proprietary Chapel, Brighton; this having been purchased for him by his father. He retained this charge until his decease, and showed himself an earnest supporter, both in public and in private, of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, of a local Scripture Readers' Society, and, above all, of the "Church Missionary Society." He went in, too, for keeping the Crystal Palace closed on Sundays. But his chief work was the establishment of St. Mary's Hall—an institution for educating the daughters of clergymen with narrow incomes. It was opened in 1836. His theology appears to have been somewhat better than that of his fellow Low-Churchmen in general; for a paper on Confession and Absolution, inserted by his biographer into his life, indicates that he held, in essence, the doctrine of ministerial forgiveness, though not intelligently, or with consciousness (so far as appears) of the grounds on which that doctrine rests. But he understood "This is My Body" as meaning "This *represents* My Body." He departed to his rest on the 21st of January, 1865.

The Rev. Hugh Stowell was born on the 3rd of December, 1799, at Douglas, in the Isle of Man. His father, the Rev. Hugh Stowell, was then in-

cumbent of a small chapel-of-ease, but afterwards became Vicar of Kirk Lonan, and latterly Rector of Ballaugh. He was "eminent for his fervent piety and simple eloquence, nor less distinguished for the primitive simplicity of his life, the sweetness of his disposition, and the refinement and courtesy of his manners;" and his sermons, two volumes of which were published by his son, the subject of the present notice, "show," says the reviewer in the *Christian Observer*, "that he preached the doctrines of the Gospel with fidelity and zeal." When it is added that two of his tracts, "*William Kelly, or the Happy Christian*," and "*The Pious Manx Peasant, or the Life of William Curphey*," are upon the Religious Tract Society's list, we may venture to infer that the distinctive Catholic doctrines of the Anglican Communion formed no distinctive part of the religious teaching given by the Rev. Hugh Stowell, senior.

Young Hugh Stowell went from his studies under his father's roof to be prepared for the university by the Rev. John Cawood, Vicar of Bewdley, in Worcestershire, from whom he went to St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, of which the Rev. John Hill, afterwards Vice-Principal, was then tutor. He had good abilities, and does not seem to have been idle; but he studied according to his own plan, and did not distinguish himself. He took his B.A. degree in 1822, and was ordained in 1823 to the curacy of Shepscombe, a chapelry in the parish of Painswick, near Stroud, in Gloucestershire. His diocesan was Dr. Ryder, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield. The following year he took the curacy

of Trinity Church, Huddersfield; and afterwards the sole charge of St. Stephen's, Salford, Manchester. "At that time," we are told, "Evangelical principles were held by but a small minority of the clergy in the vast parish of Manchester, of which Salford was but a chapelry. . . . Excellent men they were, inferior to none of their successors"—thus the reviewer in the *Christian Observer* writes. "Truly they bore the burthen and heat of the day: they laboured, and other men have entered into their labours. But they were not gifted with that rhetorical power, that rare gift of commanding rather than soliciting the rapt attention of vast crowds, which was granted to Mr. Stowell. Political dissent was violent, and Church laymen were apathetic. A Wesleyan lay gentleman, long resident in Manchester, assured us, some years before Mr. Stowell's decease, that he believed that the Church of England owed its very existence in Manchester to the exertions of Hugh Stowell. We did not agree with him at the time, nor do we now; and we relate the conversation just as it occurred, that the reader may in some measure appreciate the effect which really followed Mr. Stowell's exertions.

"He certainly possessed one advantage over most of his friends: he was an enthusiast, almost an optimist, in his views of the Church of England. He could see no infirmities, he could allow of no faults in her, except such as arose from the want of fidelity in those to whom her interests were entrusted; for which they, and not the Church, were responsible: nor in the Prayer-book, except that

a few of its terms were obsolete, and thus afforded a handle to men who did not really understand its principles.”*

The popularity in which he was held for his pulpit eloquence, and the difficulties in the way of building a new church at that time, and of getting him appointed to the incumbency of one, led to the “Trustees Church-Building Act,” under which Christ Church, Salford, was consecrated in November 1831 by Bishop Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, in whose diocese, that of Chester, Manchester was then included. Of this church Mr. Stowell became the first incumbent, and remained so as long as he lived. “For more than a quarter of a century he was the president of the Manchester and Salford Operative Protestant Association. For a still longer period he was chairman of a large Clerical Association.” “The depth of affectionate respect which was felt for Mr. Stowell in Manchester was shown by a very remarkable occurrence. A false report one day went abroad that he had died suddenly in the street. The scene on the Exchange and throughout the city was most affecting. His friends were besieged with inquiries, which they were unprepared to answer. Meanwhile, the unconscious subject of this painful excitement, having gone that morning to breakfast with the Bishop, himself drove through the centre of Manchester and Salford in an open conveyance, much perplexed by the extraordinary manner in which people regarded him, several taking off their hats and waving them over their heads ; until, observing

* *Christian Observer* for 1868, pp. 139, 140

one poor woman burst into tears, he drew up and inquired what was the matter with her, upon which she informed him. He hurried home, where, happily, he learned that the premature tidings had not yet disturbed the quiet of his family.”*

Mr. Stowell was one of the earliest, strongest, and most persevering of the opponents to the Tractarian movement. To his sermons entitled *Tractarianism tested by Holy Scripture and the Church of England* we have already referred. In one passage of them he mentions “Luther and Calvin and Zuingle” along with “the noble host of reformers on the Continent” as having “raised the fallen Church.”† In his later days he received the unsubstantial dignity of Honorary Canon of Chester. He departed to his rest on the 8th of October, 1865.

CHAPTER LII.

Polemical Period, continued. Improvements in Church Matters discussed or recommended by Low-Churchmen. Some Improvements deprecated. Abuses allowed.

WE have now arrived, in the course of these ANNALS, at the end of that period which it seemed proper to designate as the Polemical Period. And it may not be amiss to take here a brief review of the results of Low-Church work as they appeared at the time now to be spoken of. We will note some points in which Low-Church influence had been exerted for good, and then some in which it

* *Christian Observer* for 1868, p. 145.

† *Tractarianism Tested*, vol. i. p. 289.

had either been exerted for harm or else not been exerted at all.

Among the measures of improvement which had been discussed by Low-Church people and not summarily dismissed may be mentioned the presence of non-communicants at celebrations of the Holy Eucharist.* Others had been advocated, and came to be adopted by Low-Church people generally. Such was the practice of preachers with reference to the recitation of Mattins or Evensong: it appears to have been common for preachers, Low-Churchmen among the rest, to take no part in those offices, even as ordinary worshippers, but to remain in the vestry until, the prayers being ended, it was time to proceed to the pulpit. Against this practice a writer in the *Christian Observer* set himself,† and it must soon have come to an end. The offering of, or joining in, the daily service as enjoined by the Prayer-book was more than once recommended in the same periodical; ‡ and Daniel Wilson (afterwards Bishop of Calcutta) acted upon the principle so far as to start and keep up in St. Mary's, Islington, morning prayers on Wednesdays, Fridays, and saints' days; besides instituting a service on the Sundays and greater holy-days over and above what he found when he came to the parish. The observance of Ember-seasons also with special prayer was urged.§ Conformity, too, to some rubrics the observance whereof did not

* *Christian Observer*, 1836, pp. 487, 544, 599.

† *Ib.* 1839, p. 19.

‡ *Ib.* for 1833, pp. 585, 787; 1834, p. 79; 1842, p. 148, &c.

§ *Ib.* 1837, p. 316.

contravene any recognised Low-Church principle—as, for instance, those concerning the manner of announcing or concluding a lesson, epistle, or gospel—this also on the recommendation of the *Christian Observer*,* or that of such men as the late Professor Scholefield,† found speedy acceptance, though not everywhere.

As to the modes of conducting Divine Service, we find a correspondent of the *Christian Observer* tacitly taking for granted that intoning was desirable in some cases at the least,‡ and the Editor expressing, as late as 1842, a hope that Bishop Wilson meant to establish a daily choral service in his Cathedral at Calcutta.§ And even the admirers of the Gregorian chants had their advocate in the same Low-Church periodical.|| A division of the services, so as to make the function on a Sunday morning less wearisome to those engaged in it, was recommended by a correspondent as far back as 1819; the division proposed being, first Mattins, secondly, Litany and “Communion Service” (meaning, apparently, that portion of the Eucharistic Office which was vulgarly designated as “the Table Prayers”), and thirdly, Evensong.¶ We have met with a lament, in 1842, of the neglect of public catechising.**

The Low-Church party owed much of its following to the institutions called proprietary chapels.

* *Christian Observer*, 1837. I have lost the reference in detail.

† In a sermon heard by the present writer.

‡ *Christian Observer*, 1826, p. 19.

§ *Ib.* 1842, p. 319.

|| *Ib.* 1844, pp. 650, 652.

¶ *Ib.* 1819, p. 638.

** *Ib.* 1842, pp. 76, 77.

A Low-Church preacher for whom there was no immediate prospect—perhaps no prospect at all—of the incumbency of a large church would rent an unconsecrated building which had been fitted up with pulpit, reading-desk, clerk’s desk, pews, organ, and (last in estimation) altar, and officiate in it with the sanction of the incumbent of the parish, and under licence from the bishop, for the spiritual benefit or delectation of such persons as chose to rent sittings. Or the chapel might be rented by a body of trustees, or by a single lay person, who then appointed the preacher, and perhaps a reader also (as the second clergyman was called), who was responsible for the prayers alone. The mischief resulting from this state of things, or rather some of the mischief, was thus pointed out in 1829 by a correspondent of the *Christian Observer*:—“The capellau system has done much injury to the ministerial character of the clergy, deprived the people of pastoral care, and dissevered in the minds of both what our Church has so scripturally joined, ‘the Word’ and ‘the Sacraments.’ The new system of district churches is a hopeful step in the return to the ancient plan of parochial discipline.”*

If we turn our thoughts to larger matters than the interests of a single congregation, we find Low-Churchmen expressing their sense of the anomaly of an episcopal church without a bishop in it; † and their approval of the appointment of bishops to superintend ecclesiastical affairs in the Colonies. ‡

* *Christian Observer*, 1829, p. 174.

† *Ib.* 1841, p. 380.

‡ *Ib.* 1842, Preface, p. iv.

It is curious to read the record of these few instances of an appreciation of Catholic truth and practice as inculcated by the Church of England, and to remark at the same time how, when Low-Church principles were brought out by a rival school of theology and religion, many of the things thus recommended by individual Low-Churchmen here and there were subsequently denounced by Low-Churchmen more or less generally as evil. Thus one correspondent of the *Christian Observer* in 1842 questions whether the practice of daily prayers in church would conduce to edification.* Archbishop Sumner wished that Tractarians had continued the old practice of ignoring rubrics.† The same prelate deprecated choral services in parish churches.‡ The expression “anti-pew mania” occurs more than once in the *Christian Observer*.§ A correspondent of that periodical raised a protest not only against the *name* but against the architecture of All Souls, Marylebone.|| Another (whose letter the Editor printed in large type) deprecated the use of special vessels in private communions, and declared: “Even now there are many persons who would not communicate if a clergyman came to their house thus equipped, lest they should seem to countenance Popish superstition.”¶ Another objected to the opening of churches for private devotion; ** as if a church were peculiarly *unfit* for such a purpose,

* *Christian Observer*, 1842, p. 77.

† *Ib.* 1849, p. 141.

‡ *Ib.* 1849, p. 141.

§ *Ib.* 1844.

|| *Ib.* 1825, p. 748.

¶ *Ib.* 1838, p. 688.

** *Ib.* 1844, p. 610.

and so unfit as to be exempted from the application of St. Paul's words, "I will that men pray everywhere." * One of the canons of the Church of England † enacts that "when in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present." This, however, save in the Creed, was deprecated, ‡ nor do we know of its having been duly observed by any Low-Churchmen except one, the rector of a small parish in Wiltshire. Evening communion was recommended in 1842; § afternoon communion had already been common in Wales, || and the profane practice became in time almost characteristic of the Low-Church party in towns; adopted, as we believe, for the express purpose of encouraging irreverence to the Sacrament—that is, of preventing people from being more reverent with regard to it than Low-Church teachers chose. When there was a movement arising for the increase of the episcopate, a declaration which was got up in favour thereof was signed by a preponderance of High-Churchmen, a sprinkling of moderate men, and only a few Low-Churchmen. ¶ The line taken by the *Christian Observer* was that the scheme would revolutionise the English Church, and that the introduction of "gig bishops" (as a certain noble lord had termed them) would "prove fatal to prelatic episcopacy" in five years. ** And five years later, the erection and endowment of

* 1 Tim. ii. 8.

† Canon xviii.

‡ *Christian Observer*, 1843, p. 527.

§ *Ib.* 1842, p. 600.

|| *Ib.* 1843, p. 24.

¶ *Ib.* 1860, p. 258.

** *Ib.* pp. 259-263.

new bishoprics was opposed on the ground that funds were thus diverted from the endowment of livings and the maintenance of more clergy.*

Some manifest abuses, moreover, remained either unnoticed, or at all events unattacked by Low-Churchmen. Thus Legh Richmond records, without a word of disapprobation, how on one occasion, when he had been preaching for the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, the offerings were collected from pew to pew by ladies supported by gentlemen.† We ourselves once heard, in another quarter, of the same thing being done; and we heard of two coins being put into the plate by one of the congregation, who said aloud at the same time, "Those are for your two beautiful eyes."

As to abuses connected with funeral sermons, it may be mentioned that when the Rev. Josiah Pratt had departed to his rest, "Mr. Bickersteth was," we are told, invited *by the family* to preach one of the "funeral sermons" for him. We should have thought that with the duty of arranging Christian teaching for the congregation assembling in a place of public worship the family of the deceased had nothing whatever to do. For aught, however, that appears in Mr. Bickersteth's biography, Mr. Bickersteth himself did not see anything improper in the matter; and his biographer, Mr. Birks, recorded it without appearing to see that there was any need of an explanation.‡

* *Christian Observer*, 1865, p. 399.

† *Memoir of the Rev. Legh Richmond*, p. 156.

‡ *Birks's Memoir of the Rev. E. Bickersteth*, vol. ii. p. 282.

The unrubrical innovation of repeating the General Thanksgiving along with the officiating minister appears to have come into vogue about the year 1864. The object of it was to alter the meaning of words, and to make ground for the assertion that "general" meant "to be generally repeated aloud," and hence to avoid the implied contrast between two things one of which it was convenient to forget, viz. a general confession of sins and a special confession of sins.

The marriage of a Christian to a person who has never been baptized is clearly not what St. Paul terms a marriage "in the Lord." A vicar, on being asked to solemnise such a marriage, refused. The opinion of a lawyer in Doctors' Commons was asked, and given, to the effect that the vicar could be compelled to solemnise it. This was sent to the Editor of the *Christian Observer* in order that the matter might be "clearly understood," and the Editor inserted it without a single word expressive of concern at the fact that such an abuse, such a profanation of a holy Christian rite, should be permitted.*

So little had the Low-Church party done for that Church in general whereof they were members in that period of time the narrative of which we now close. And in the next portion of our ANNALS we shall have only too much occasion to note how in the succeeding period the only progress which they made was from bad to worse. For the present it may be well to note a few instances of remarkable ignorance in theology, as manifested

* *Christian Observer*, 1821.

by Low-Church people. Thus the remark was made in the *Christian Observer* that Ritualism cannot affect the soul: * as if Ritualism were anything else than a system of acts done from the soul (or rather from the spirit) towards God. "The Holy Ghost, the *Author* and Giver of life" is an expression occurring in the same periodical.† Evidently the writer did not know the Nicene Creed in the original, or how to punctuate a translation of it. In another place the "Hagiographa" were spoken of as consisting of the Psalms, the Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, without mention being made of any other books.‡ The "Apostolic Fathers" were spoken of as "very poor authorities on matters of doctrine."§ A clergyman, too, of our own acquaintance, to whom had been awarded by his university a prize for an essay on some subject concerning Christian Missions, and who now occupies a very important post in the Church, and was once in communication with some agents of the "Church Missionary Society" about some educational establishment for the presidency whereof he had been advised to apply, had it alleged by them as an objection against him that in his essay he had shown too wide a circle of reading, and not confined his references to Low-Church works! This we had from the clergyman's own lips.

* *Christian Observer*, 1867, p. 137.

† *Ib.* 1862, p. 301.

‡ *Ib.* p. 371, *note*.

§ *Ib.* p. 444.

CHAPTER LIII.

The Immoral Period. Decline of the Low-Church Party in Spirituality, Moral Tone, and Intellectual Power.

By the title prefixed to this chapter we designate that period in the history of the Low-Church party the events of which we are now to relate. Our reasons for so designating it will be manifest as we proceed in our narrative; and if dishonesty of profession, the bearing of false witness, vindictive spite, profaneness and sacrilege, and wanton and cruel slander of the innocent and unoffending, be deemed sufficient cause for designating any set of proceedings as immoral, our reasons for speaking now of the immoral period in the history of the Low-Church party will be only too fully justified.

A marked decline had taken place in the spiritual character of the party, and there was also a perceptible diminution of its intellectual power. In 1867 Mr. Ryle (afterwards Bishop) spoke of the "dry rot" as being among Low-Churchmen. As far back as 1843 an observer had remarked that Low-Churchmen, as a party, were powerless in the University of Oxford, and could make but little demonstration of active resistance to Tractarianism.* And if such was the state of the party at one of the chief centres of intellectual life in England, we may be very sure that intellectual and spiritual feebleness must have been a characteristic

* *Letters from Oxford*, by "Ignotus," cited in the *Christian Observer* for 1843, p. 497.

of the party throughout the country. In short, the party which called itself Evangelical was now the rag-end of that party which had called itself Evangelical some sixty or seventy years before. Ignorance of theology,* and narrowness of mind shown in the use of what theological truth it still had, had come to be among its characteristics. As to piety and spirituality, a contributor to the *Christian Observer* for 1859 spoke about "the expiring embers of the spiritual revival of the last century;" † and a writer in the same magazine for 1866 furnished to it three articles on "the Church in a Laodicean state," and with special reference to the Low-Church party. And the Editor asked, with reference to the hard things said in the first of these articles, "Can we dare to say they are undeserved?" In a later article the writer said: "My saddened view of the state of the Church is drawn from three or four well-known facts. There never was a time, since the days of Whitfield and Romaine, when wealthy professors, worldly evangelicals, were so common, so numerous, yet how rare is it to hear a bold and faithful protest against worldliness and the love of riches from the pulpit! There never was a time

* A remarkable instance, showing how little Mr. Bridges, pious and devoted clergyman as he was, knew about the nature of the very dispensation under which he was living, may be seen in his remarks about the lot. In his *Exposition of the Book of Proverbs*, on Proverbs xvi. 33, we do indeed read, "Admitting it to be a Scriptural ordinance, its expediency under our more full light is more than doubtful;" but on chapter xviii. 18 he wrote: "There seems . . . no Scriptural prohibition to the use of this ordinance, provided it be exercised in a reverential dependence upon God [!], and not profaned for common purposes or worldly ends."

† *Christian Observer* for 1859, p. 45.

when so many young men attended church on the Sunday, and broke the seventh and other commandments on the Monday; yet what preacher ever dares to speak plainly of the breach of that commandment from the pulpit? There never was a time when so many regular church-goers professed to admire and believe the Gospel, and yet admitted that their hearts were unaffected by it; yet when are such persons earnestly dealt with from the pulpit? We read of a preacher of old who, when he found his congregation listless and unconcerned, sat down and burst into tears. Richard Cecil, under like circumstances, resolved "I *will* be heard!" and called out from the pulpit, "Only yesterday a poor man was hanged at Tyburn!" But nowadays, even good and thoroughly enlightened men get up in the pulpit and explain a parable or a promise, see their people calmly self-satisfied at the beginning and at the end of their sermon, close their book without even a hope that one soul has been awakened by what they have said, and yet go quietly home to dinner, as if all was right, and as it should be."* The same writer, citing from a speech made by an earnest friend of the "Church Missionary Society," said: "A great change has lately come upon us. During the last two years, not more than one candidate for missionary work has offered from both Universities. In the course of the last half-year not one person has offered from any quarter." †

* *Christian Observer* for 1866, pp. 209, 210.

† *Ib.* p. 211.

We have noticed the decline in spirituality ourselves. We once described to some Low-Church people certain proceedings at which we had been present, and at which a proposal had been made for promoting the cause of Church missions, but had utterly broken down. The reply was that our narrative had caused much *amusement*. On another occasion, in our narrating in the same company how M. Vianney, the holy Curé of Ars, had said with tears, when ordered by his Diocesan to diminish his austerities and take meat at least once a day, "What should a sinner like me do with meat?" the account was received with a *shout of laughter*. And yet we have no reason to think that those Low-Church people were worse in regard of spiritual religion than Low-Church people in general.

With Christian spirituality Christian charity is essentially connected, and the charitable way in which Low-Church writers contemplated the memory of such men as St. Chrysostom or St. Augustine of Canterbury is illustrated by the author of a review, who speaks of those eminent saints as having used outside show and splendour merely to gain adherents or to carry a point in politics; not to convert the heart or to win souls for heaven.*

With this decline in spirituality there was, as the reader will naturally infer for himself, a decline in common moral tone. In the year 1839 the Rev. Edward Bickersteth had preached a sermon in St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, on behalf of the

* Review of *The Church and the World*, in *Christian Observer* for 1866, p. 647.

London City Mission, a society which the Bishop of London, in consequence of its principles, had forbidden the clergy of his diocese to advocate from their pulpits. If ever there was a case of self-willed disobedience to authority—if ever there was a case of violating the ordination vow of obedience to the godly admonitions, and submission to the godly judgments, of the Ordinary and other chief ministers—here was surely one; and yet, writing in 1851, Mr. Bickersteth's biographer, the Rev. T. R. Birks, thus introduces his account of the matter: "The sermon for the City Mission was undertaken under circumstances which involved some self-denial and moral courage."* Again, when Stanley, the African explorer, published his account of the wholesale murders perpetrated by himself on poor savages, whose sole offence had been the stealing of a few oars or other chattels, on account whereof, when that self-conceited villain was to give an address before the Royal Geographical Society, the President and sundry members withdrew rather than countenance a murderer in his wickedness, the *Evangelical Record* had no word of condemnation for the bloody transactions, but rather congratulated its readers on the prospects which Stanley had opened of the extension of Christianity. Nor did Low-Churchmen care what they said to the discredit of their theological opponents. The *Rock* newspaper stated one day that a priest, an associate of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, had been

* *Memoir*, 2nd edition, vol. ii. p. 143. The first edition was published in 1851.

sentenced to seven years' transportation for forging bank-cheques, the facts being that the priest named had died some years before, and that no such accusation had ever been so much as hinted against him—at least so far as a former colleague of his had been able to ascertain.* A Low-Church clergyman once said in a sermon, "There are men in our own Church who say that they find a consolation in the worship of the Virgin which they are unable to find elsewhere." Being pressed to give particulars, he declined, on the ground that to do so would involve a breach of confidence. Another Low-Church clergyman wrote to the *Record* that a papal dispensation had been found among the papers of a departed Anglican priest, authorising him to continue a professed Anglican, and with it a list of other priests holding similar dispensations. But on being challenged to produce the document, he was obliged to own that he could not.†

Nor was this all. We shall have hereafter to mention a work entitled *The Priest in Absolution*—a work never published, but printed for private circulation amongst the clergy, it being a manual of advice as to the manner of dealing with penitents pastorally, and touching incidentally upon various classes of sins. We shall also have to introduce to our readers a certain amiable Low-Church society called the "Church Association,"

* *Church Times*, January 1, 1875. The number of the *Rock* was that for the last week in the previous December.

† The sermon was preached in West Hackney Parish Church, February 2, 1878, by the Rev. C. J. Robinson.

established, according to its own professions, to uphold the doctrines, principles, and order of the Church of England, and to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of spiritual religion. In the autumn of 1877 an anti-confessional lecture was delivered in Surrey Chapel, Blackfriars, and the lecturer apologised for his dullness by stating that "the only available copy of *The Priest in Absolution* in possession of the Church Association had been sent to Birmingham to be used in Mr. Willett's case." This Mr. Willett was Vicar of All Saints', Bromwich, in Staffordshire, and the case against him was a false and malicious libel in which, some months before, he had been charged with an act of immorality. He had then demanded a commission of inquiry, which found that there was no *prima facie* ground at all for further proceedings; his enemies, however, had now applied for a summons against him, and to the magistrates of Birmingham, there being no chance of obtaining a summons where the prosecutors were known; and the method which was being taken by counsel for inducing the stipendiary magistrate to grant a summons was to allege that Mr. Willett was member of a religious society, called the Society of the Holy Cross—of which also our readers will hear more by-and-by—and to call upon him to produce his copy of *The Priest in Absolution*. The case, it is needless to say, broke down again, the applicants being dismissed and ordered to pay the costs.*

After this it is hardly worth while to mention

* *Church Times*, October 5, 1877, p. 557.

so small a peccadillo as the playing tricks with (not to say stealing) other people's property. The *Church Times* was, and still is, an organ of advanced High-Churchmen; and (as we shall see hereafter) the *Rock* came into existence a few years later as an organ of extreme Low-Churchmen. On September 28, 1877, the following appeared from the pen of the Editor of the former paper:—
“A lady writes to us from the Lancashire border of Cumberland that her last week's copy of the *Church Times* did not arrive on Saturday as usual, but that on Wednesday she received our own printed label enclosing a copy of the *Rock*. . . . We regret to add that complaints of postal irregularities are constantly reaching us of such a nature as leaves little doubt in our mind that the Post Office people in some places have been tampered with.”*

Theoretically there was the same exaltation of preaching above every other ordinance, and in some cases—probably in many—the theory was acted upon to such an extent that pastoral visitation was neglected. In the knowledge of our informant, a Low-Church clergyman was repeatedly asked to visit a sick parishioner, and excused himself on the ground that he had to prepare or deliver a sermon to young men. “Mr. M.,” was the reply, “we don't want all this preaching, but we do want pastoral visitation.” When the Fever Hospital in Islington was opened no Islington clergyman would visit it. A High-Church clergyman then undertook to visit it, in defiance of a prohibition from the

* *Church Times*, September 28, 1877, p. 535.

very men who would not do the work themselves. At the same time the Low-Church pulpit had lost much of its power, partly owing to the ignorance, the illiterateness, or the intellectual stupidity of many Low-Church preachers, and partly to a notion, which some Low-Church preachers had taken up, that every sermon ought to have in it a statement of the scheme of salvation.*

As to failure in intellectual vigour, and the manifestation of unreasoning stupidity, we may note that in a leading article in the *Church Times* for December 7, 1877, the writer of that article professed to have examined Whitaker's *Reference Catalogue of Current Literature*, a publication comprising catalogues of stock issued by the chief bookselling firms of the United Kingdom (150 in number), in order to find out how many authors, amongst Low-Church clergymen then living, had published works with any claim to be called theology proper, and with any prospect of duration, to the exclusion of mere hortatory sermons (though not academic lectures or conferences), pietistic booklets, tracts, religious biographies, expositions of Scripture for family reading, and the like. Out of fifteen catalogues examined with this view, only five contained any books of the class sought, and those five contained the names of only *eight* Low-Church authors; and really half of the works produced by these were from the pen of *one* sole author, the Rev. T. R. Birks.

As an instance of unreasoning narrow-minded-

* We ourselves heard this stated as a sound maxim. So Mr. Bickersteth noted in his *Memoir of Newton*, pp. 301-2.

ness, we may notice having seen, in the *Record*, about the year 1856, a letter from a correspondent who had been into a country church and seen there a red curtain hanging up—a dossel, if we remember right. The writer proceeded to say that he did not know anything of the doctrine preached in the said church, but that he deemed the red curtain objectionable in itself!

How far a Low-Churchman could go in the nonsense-line may be seen by two quotations from a gentleman who in matters of the world was not by any means a fool. John Macgregor, Esq., Master of Arts, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and well known as the owner and navigator of the *Rob Roy* canoe, wrote, in 1866, admiringly of the *Times* for “exploding the ‘pernicious nonsense’ of *doll-dressed* parsons.”* The same gentleman, in the account of a later cruise, relieves his stomach of the following effusion:—

“For the free Bible—the right to tell what Popery was, is, and wants to be—you must hush to a whisper any voice you have, and still be reckoned even then a monomaniac. We must be ‘charitable’—yes, and for whom our charity? Not for our women, our children, our herds of ignorant and weak who are beguiled, but for the army of foreign priests who stream over the land, and raise an alien name above our Queen’s. Is it not just possible that our wondrous delicacy in this matter is not from love, but fear? Rather,

* *Rob Roy on the Baltic*, p. 140. Mr. Macgregor professes himself a member of the Anglican Communion by speaking of the control over the clergy which (he says) “would be exercised in our Church by the bishop of the diocese.”—*Ib.* p. 305.

perhaps, it is because that sort of tone pays best in general popularity : nobody is so sure of approval as the man who is ‘fiercely moderate.’ If you want to screen those people here whom the Romish Bishop of Cracow (who ought to know them best) calls ‘furies, not women,’ to keep English girls in their prisons under the ‘moral’ restraint of character lost by escape ; if you want to justify disloyalty, to hand over to a narrow celibate clique of alien hopes and sympathies of our nation, to flout the nobles of England cringing to the ‘Prince’ last made by an old bachelor abroad, to stifle free speech, to buy short peace by bribes, ever larger, never enough, to fasten on us again the fangs that sucked England’s best blood once, and to shame our nation in presence of the others who have writhed out from under intolerable coils ; if you will fear a huge system for its power, and succour it because it is weak—wonder at its wealth, yet pay it because it is poor—bow down to it as divine, yet laugh at it only as a ghost ; if you will enthrone error, and put fetters upon truth—bind heavier ‘them that are fast bound in misery and iron,’ and set the oppressor free—put priests for our lawgivers and a gigantic imposture for our faith, drown truth in fables and shut our open Bible : if you want to do these things with impunity, nay, to be called ‘liberal’ while you do them—only say it is in the name of ‘religion’ and at the bidding of the ‘priests,’ and mind you say ‘the priests of Rome,’ for to do these things at the bidding of any others would convict you of ‘bigotry,’ or treason, or of craven fear.” *

* *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, pp. 435-6.

CHAPTER LIV.

Immoral Period, continued. Failure of the Low-Church Party in Controversy with Tractarianism. Employment by Low-Churchmen of Force and Compulsion. Occasion hereof—the Rise of Ritualism. Unreasoning Character (and yet Reasonableness) of Low-Church Opposition.

“Brethren, be not children in understanding : howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men.”—1 CORINTHIANS xiv. 20.

NOT only had there been in the Low-Church party a failure of intellectual power in general, but there was a failure in the intellectual controversy with Tractarianism in particular. No Tractarian had been won over to Low-Church ways by the force of reasoning. The self-assertion of a Ryle * and a Waldegrave † was felt to be self-assertion and

* We have before us a tract, not four pages long, by the Rev. John Charles Ryle, afterwards Bishop of Liverpool, entitled *A Solemn Appeal!* (a warning against the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration), in which such phrases as “I see,” “I think,” “I say,” occur no less than twenty-one times, and the first personal pronoun singular nominative occurs thirty-eight times.

† The following is extracted from *The Way of Peace : Four Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1847, 1848, by the Hon. and Rev. Samuel Waldegrave, M.A.*, London, 1848 : “And here I must affirm that (whatever be the uses to which man has *applied* the term) the Holy Ghost when, in the written Word, He speaks of ‘the Church’ absolutely (in such passages, for instance, as ‘Christ loved the Church ;’ ‘upon this rock I will build My Church’), doth not mean any one visible ecclesiastical corporation, nor any aggregate assemblage of visible ecclesiastical corporations, but that ‘whole family in heaven and earth,’ known indeed unto God, but ‘indefinable’ by man, which is styled ‘the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven.’

“Chosen of the Father in Christ before the foundation of the world : ‘redeemed to God by the blood of the Lamb out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation ;’ each in due time

no more. The exegesis of an Alford and an Ellicott had taught young students to read Scripture with their naked eyes, and not through the flawed spectacles of Puritanism. The distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church were therefore more and more accepted, even in spite of the Protestant proclivities and determinations of the learned commentators just named. The Broad-Church school, in fact, had drawn to itself most or all of those Low-Churchmen who were disposed to think, and who at the same time failed to accept the Catholic faith in its integrity; while such as were open to Catholic reasoning found themselves one by one among the number of High-Churchmen. Among these last was John Henry Newman, afterwards Cardinal, who was led to embrace the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration through reading the work of John Bird Sumner, afterwards Archbishop, on Apostolical Preaching; and we could mention others of our own personal acquaintance. The diminution of the Low-Church party in point of members is evidenced by the fact that for several years before 1870, when the newspaper-stamp duty was abolished, the stamped copies of the *Record* had diminished by several hundreds every year, while almost exactly the same number was annually added to the circulation of the *Guardian*, a moderate High-Church paper. As for the remnant

made willing in the day of Christ's power by the Spirit of the Lord; they are, partly triumphant in heaven, partly militant upon earth: together they constitute the 'mystical body of God's dear Son.'" The reader will observe that Mr. Waldegrave gives no proof of these assertions; the only argument by which he supports them is contained in the words "I must affirm."

of the party weakened by the defection of their former allies, and worsted in argument by the Tractarians, there was no course left them save to use, as far as they could, the weapons of force and compulsion in various forms: the lawless violence of mobs, the power of the Government of the country exercised in the name and under the pretence of law; falsehood being solemnly promulgated from the judgment-seat, a secular tribunal being set up for the settling of spiritual causes, and the constitution of the country in Church and State being thus contravened, and unconstitutional decrees enforced with pretended spiritual censures, the exaction of ruinous costs, and imprisonment. And it is curious and instructive to compare the practice of the Low-Church party in the period whereof we now write with the principles of the same party as declared a generation (or nearly so) before. Writing at the end of 1848 the Editor of the *Christian Observer* had spoken of that "violence which characterises the advocates of error when thwarted in their projects,"* little thinking what an exemplification his words would have in the later history of his own party.

Such means as those just specified were brought into operation in the period of which we are now to write, and the antagonism of Low-Churchmen to Catholicism was shown in manifold ways besides. How much the peace and union among members of families was broken up can never be known, of course, till that great day when all hidden things shall be brought to light; but the cases, known to

* Preface to the volume for 1848.

the writer, of ridicule, insult, and angry rating on the Low-Church side against High-Churchmanship can hardly have been exceptional, though one case indeed, known to him, was, he would venture to hope, unique—that of a wife so far ignoring her subordinate place as to assemble her children and servants for devotion and worship apart from the husband, father, and master, under which *régime* the children soon learned to argue with their father as with one in dangerous error. It is curious, by the way, to note that in the case now before the writer's mind, one of the children learnt to repent of such conduct, having joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

As one instance of the breaches caused in families by the opposition of Low-Church people to those who had adopted High-Church ways, it may be mentioned that the observance by a High-Church brother, in his own individual practice alone, of the Church's seasons of fasting and abstinence was specified in the hearing of the writer as a reason by itself why his Low-Church sisters should refuse to live with him ; and it was specified in such a way as to convey the idea that in the opinion of the speaker it was a very sufficient reason. In another case, which occurred in the experience of the writer's informant, a clergyman who had begun to teach in his church the Catholic faith in its integrity, and to practise Catholic ritual, was informed by another member of the family that if he persisted in so doing he might count on being disinherited.

In the conduct of laity towards clergy there were

anonymous letters written to newspapers holding up the clergymen to public ridicule and detestation. Abusive letters also were addressed to the obnoxious individuals themselves.* The introduction of halfpenny postcards gave opportunity to the cowardly of insulting or slandering them publicly without fear of detection, and the opportunity was not lost † Misrepresentation, of course, was the order of the day—misrepresentation on the platform and by means of the press. Violent harangues were delivered against those who (it was alleged) ate the bread of the Church while undermining the Church's doctrines, the ignorant and prejudiced public assuming, in their ignorance and prejudice, that the description applied with truth to High-Churchmen and not to Low-Churchmen.

It was in fact the old story, the manifestation of man's natural enmity to God's truth and God's

* As a specimen of one of these the following may be cited from the *Church Times* of December 5, 1879, p. 766. It was addressed to the Rev. E. Husband, Incumbent of St. Michael's, Folkestone:—"Rev. Husband,—I see by the *Daily Telegraph* you have had the audacity, by written words, to ask, in church, for the prayers of your congregation on behalf of that mad Mackonochie and his tools. You are evidently one of the herd of apostate impostors now feeding on the Church of England, and I (as a faithful member of that Church, with relatives in it and ancestors as numerous friends and supporters of it as ever yours were) beg now to comply with your request, for once, and pray that the curse of God may soon come upon the whole bunch of you.—Yours truly, THOS. THOMSON, Worcester, December 1, 1879.—P.S. You can, of course, as lawless read this to your parishioners."

† The following postcard was once received by the present writer, who, on another occasion, received one of a character with which he will not pollute these pages:—"Be so good as to send me your prices for confessings—Unconditional Confession, Conditional ditto; for Black Sins, for White Sins, and for the Vulgar fractions for yours, CHAS. NEWBURY, Old Park Road."

will ; and the spirit of Antichrist, working towards denial of God manifest in flesh. “The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” In the earliest times of Christianity this enmity had been shown towards the Church in general by the Jews and heathen outside. In later times it had been shown by heretical members of the Church against those who, holding the Catholic faith, testified against Arianism. And in these times it was shown again by heretical members of the Church against those who, holding the same Catholic faith, testified against Zuinglianism. And it was shown by them all the more eagerly and persistently, not only because the struggle between themselves and their opponents was felt by them to be a struggle between two antagonistic religions, but also because they felt that their own credit for honesty in the eyes of the public could only be kept up by damaging the credit of their opponents.

The chief occasion for all this Low-Church hostility had been given by a development which the Tractarian movement was taking : we mean, by the practice of what came to be called Ritualism, as the practisers were termed Ritualists : the term *ritualism* being understood to denote any alteration in the mode of conducting Divine Service made in the direction of Catholicism, or of what was deemed Catholicism. Thus it included any of the following usages :—Facing east at prayers ; reciting the Office musically ; singing hymns or anthems at parts of the service where no singing was prescribed in the Prayer-book ; preaching in surplice ;

vesting the altar with coloured cloths according to the ecclesiastical season, and wearing stoles of like colour ; the use of the cross, either materially, by placing it over the altar, or in a window, or on a rood-screen, or embroidering it on cloths or vestments, or actually signing it towards the people in benediction, or over the element of a sacrament in consecration ; the wearing of special vestments in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist ; the lighting of candles or lamps for the sake of symbolism ; the ornamenting of the altar with flowers ; the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist ; the mixing the chalice with water ; the burning of incense ; the use of processions, with or without banners. There were also some other points observed by some clergymen, but of too small consequence to be worth mentioning here.

This development had commenced very soon after the commencement of the Tractarian movement. Of that movement, indeed, it was the legitimate outcome ; and from the very first it had met with opposition from the Low-Church party. In 1837 “an eye-witness” wrote to the *Christian Observer* that a church was being erected for the Rev. W. Dodsworth, “decorated with ornaments improper in a Protestant place of worship, such as the heads and wings of cherubim and seraphim,”* &c. This was followed by a letter from “an afflicted spectator,” drawing attention to various “portentous” innovations at Oxford ; viz. reading prayers at the altar-rail, facing east ; placing a cross, either sculptured or in stained glass, over the altar ;

* *Christian Observer* for 1837, p. 486.

the use of a credence ; the wearing of a stole by deacons over the left shoulder only ; Mr. Newman's delivery of lectures on Romanism, in a chapel within St. Mary's, without any previous service or prayer ; Dr. Pusey's lecturing apparently in a similar way upon the types and prophecies. On which the Editor observed : " The particular observances above alluded to are peculiarly to be deprecated, because they are part and parcel of a doctrinal and ecclesiastical system which tends to subvert the pure Gospel of Christ, and the foundations of the Protestant Church."* And he included in his condemnation " Mr. Newman's accompanying the administration of the Lord's Supper with unprescribed bowings, approachings, retirings, very much after the fashion of Laud at St. Catherine-Cree Church.' † Thus had begun that stage in the great Anglican revival which was some years afterwards the most striking feature which that revival had, and which brought a new nickname upon the more advanced men of the High-Church party. And thus began that opposition, unreasoning though reasonable, on the part of their Low-Church brethren, the carrying out of which has helped in no small degree to fix upon the Low-Church party the stigma of senseless folly. The opposition was unreasoning, for it was little else than a blind repugnance to everything which the Low-Church party had not taken up. But it was reasonable, for it proceeded from the feeling, grounded in truth, that those who adopted the

* *Christian Observer* for 1837, p. 505.

† *Ib.* p. 506.

obnoxious usages were of a different religion to the Low-Church party.

If, indeed, the religion of both parties had been one and the same in the main, only varying according to the different constitution of different minds, the Low-Churchman would have rejoiced to adopt the symbolism which his High-Church brother had pointed out. True piety delights in expressing itself to God in all possible ways, and in testifying to God's truth before men by all possible means. Here was a new way found out—the way of symbolism,—new, we repeat, for it was so both to those who found it out as well as to their Low-Church brethren;—and true piety, it might have been expected, would have rejoiced to accept the newly-found usages. The practice of wearing the stole over the left shoulder alone supplied what, in the absence of the linen dalmatic, the Church of England entirely lacked—a distinctive badge for a whole order in the ministry, marking off the deacon both from the presbyter above him and from the choirman or reader below him; and thus was a testimony to the desirableness of the Apostolic principle, in accepting which men of all religious parties agreed—“Let all things be done decently and in order.”

The use of the surplice in the pulpit as well as in the desk might have commended itself to everyone who received his minister as an ambassador for Christ rather than as a mere man of learning; and in this there was no avowed difference between the Low-Churchman and the High-Churchman.

The chanting of the Psalms might have been

deemed proper by those who, being acquainted with the Scriptures, knew that the Psalms were composed for the purpose of being sung; and as for reciting the service musically on one note, a writer in the *Christian Observer* had remarked that that practice was sometimes preferable.*

To the use of the cross, whether materially or in act, an outsider might well wonder what objection could possibly be entertained by any Christians, and least of all by any Low-Churchmen. For there is one thing whereof the sign of the cross, howsoever presented to the view, reminds the intelligent Christian, and that is, atonement through Christ's Death; and that was the main distinguishing doctrine of the Low-Church party when it arose. To put the cross, then, in the most conspicuous part of the church—to put it over the screen which separates nave from chancel; to mark it upon all furniture and vestments; and frequently to trace it on or towards the person—might reasonably be deemed a legitimate following out of Evangelical principles.

Charity, moreover, tends to union rather than to disunion. It regrets every lack of Christian unanimity; it rejoices to find points wherein men may agree without compromising what any of them may believe to be truth, and without implying any encouragement of what is amiss in practice. Unfortunately, however, all these con-

* *Christian Observer* for 1826, p. 19. The Rev. W. Milton, Incumbent of St. Mark's, Sheffield, at a conference of Low-Church clergy held at York in April 1878, recommended chanting of the Psalms in the evening at least, and by a surpliced choir.

siderations, and such considerations as these, were overborne by those principles of Zuinglianism which tend to eliminate everything objective from our religious belief, to make religion itself a mere set of subjective feelings and emotions, and to deny in effect that Christ is the Saviour of the body. To turn from the people at the Creed and in prayer was an expression of the truth that God is outside of us. To make much use of the body in bowing and the like was an expression of the truth that God must be worshipped with our bodies as well as with our spirits. And whatever tended to enhance the dignity of the Sacraments in their administration was in direct contradiction to the doctrine of sacraments as taught by Zwingli and his followers; whether it were the use of special vestments, or the extraordinary use of artificial light, or the solemn bringing up of the elements to the altar from a side-table or credence, or the solemn ablution of the sacred vessels as soon as the service was done.

This was felt by both parties. But inasmuch as the detailed account of the matter would fail to commend itself fully to intelligent students of Holy Scripture, Low-Church people for the most part found it convenient to oppose Catholic ritual under the general name of Popery. Their argument, in brief, was this:—Papists adopt the usages in question, Protestants do not; therefore, though there may be nothing wrong in the things themselves, yet the use of them tends towards Popery, and is therefore not to be allowed; and those who allow the use of them are themselves working

their way towards Popery. This logic was quite good enough for the general public; and under the influence of it the general public came very easily to consider that the revived usages were wrong in themselves. And in this conclusion they were practically encouraged by the Low-Church clergy, who were well pleased to have their hearers opposing Ritualism and Ritualists on any Protestant grounds. And there was in all this a certain amount of unreality and false pretence. Sometimes the plea put forth was the danger of offending weak brethren: the weak brethren being in this case the Low-Church party, who were moving all the powers against the Ritualists; and these last being the strong, who were to show Christian consideration for their brethren. Thus, at the consecration, on the 28th of May, 1859, of All Saints', Margaret Street, the congregation of which was then supposed to be the most advanced of High-Church congregations, the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) preached from the text, "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak;" * the announcement of which compelled one respected High-Church clergyman to stuff his pocket-handkerchief into his mouth with all haste, so utterly absurd was the implied pretence. Nor did it ever, so far as we can make out, occur to those Low-Churchmen who took this line, that if they and their party were the weak, and if High-Churchmen were the strong, and therefore bound, on St. Paul's principles, to avoid giving offence, Low-Churchmen were on

* 1 Cor. viii. 9.

their parts equally bound to abstain from judging High-Churchmen.* Sometimes, too, the obnoxious usage was decried as the badge of a party. Thus a friend of ours, a member of St. John's College, Oxford, when Dr. Wynter was President, called upon Dr. Wynter to ask his signature to some testimonial wherein, in designating the college, he had abbreviated the word "Saint," not with "St.," but with a single "S.;" and the President, with much gravity, noticed this to our friend, and asked him whether he was aware that by using the abbreviation in question he was identifying himself with a certain party in the Church. It was, of course, an obvious reply to those who took such a line,—Very good, and you have therefore nothing to do save to adopt the usage in question yourselves, as on independent grounds it is desirable that you should do, and then it will be the badge of a party no longer. The refusal, however, of Low-Churchmen in general to act thus showed very plainly that the real motive with Low-Churchmen in general was a dislike of the usages themselves. And as in many cases the usages were a simple carrying out of Prayer-book rules, and a development of the Prayer-book system, Low-Churchmen did thus pass upon themselves a sentence of judgment that those rules and that system were not by them heartily accepted. In connexion herewith, and in illustration of the manner in which Low-Churchmen assented and consented to all and everything contained and prescribed in and

* Rom. xiv. 3: "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not: and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth."

by the *Book of Common Prayer*, may be mentioned that at the Gateshead Vestry-meeting which was held on Easter Tuesday in the year 1867, the Rector of the parish, Archdeacon Prest, a nominee of Bishop Baring of Durham, urged the parishioners to sign a petition in favour of the Clerical Vestments Bill, then before Parliament (but which did not pass): and did so on the ground that the Eucharistic "vestments were clearly sanctioned by the law, and therefore the sooner the law was altered, in order to put in a position of wrong-doers those clergymen who wore vestments, the better." * Similarly, a writer in the *Christian Observer* for the same year recommended the bishops to threaten Ritualists with *excision*; adding, "If the law should prove to be adverse or ineffective, let the bishops bring the whole weight of their influence, in and out of Parliament, to bear upon effecting . . . an alteration of the law." In other words, "If the Ritualists should be legally declared to be faithful, Low-Churchmen were not to secede, but to get the law altered so as to square with their unfaithfulness, and that the hitherto faithful clergy might be driven out."

* *Church News*, May 8, 1867.

CHAPTER LV.

Immoral Period, continued. The Persecution becomes systematic. Formation of the "Church Association." Distinct from the Prayer-book Revision Society. Manner of Working. Liverpool Memorials against Ritualism. Agitation in the Salisbury Diocese. Clerical Vestments Bill. Guarantee Fund of the "Church Association." Counter-declaration to a Catholic Memorial. Archdeacon Jacob's Memorial. Rev. J. Ormiston at St. Alban's, Holborn. Archbishop Longley and Mr. Weld. Disturbances in Stoke Newington.

"Why dost Thou shew me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance? for spoiling and violence are before me: and there are that raise up strife and contention."—HABAKKUK i. 3.

As former chapters have shown, persecution was not an entirely new thing in the experience of faithful Churchmen. Besides the instances which have been already given, and, in particular, the persecution of Mr. Bryan King by the churchwardens and mob, aided and abetted by Bishop Tait of London and the Queen's Government, we may note that a few months after the consecration of Christ Church, Clapham, which took place in May 1862, one of the churchwardens called upon the Incumbent, the Rev. Bradley Abbott, and intimated that unless he was prepared to give up reciting the Office in monotone, the party which he represented had determined to retire from the church, and to give their clergyman no peace of mind or body as long as he remained incumbent, and would do their best to starve him out of the parish. We may also mention the case of the Rev. J. B. Pollock, who had taken charge of a mission under Dr. Oldknow, then Vicar of Holy Trinity,

Bordesley, Birmingham. In a district containing five thousand people, the poorest part of Birmingham, Mr. Pollock had got his first temporary church opened in September 1865. Then the *Record* newspaper opened its columns to false statements, and the stirring up of opposition in other ways, and in 1868 a Protestant mob took to assembling outside the church, hooting the congregation, and attempting to maltreat Mr. Pollock; insomuch that he had to be protected by the police during a space of three months.

Now, however, the persecution became systematic as well as persistent. The object, it will be remembered, was to eliminate from the Church of England such points of Catholic faith and Catholic worship as were contravened by Zuinglianism: and, with this view, the plan was to use every means that could be used against the maintainers of Catholic faith and Catholic worship in their integrity. Catholic principles were to be attacked in Catholic persons. Some leading Low-Churchmen put their heads together, and in 1865 there came into being a society which before many years had passed became a great religious scandal—the greatest, perhaps, with which English religion has ever been disgraced: a society which thus proclaimed itself on the title-pages of its reports:—“The CHURCH ASSOCIATION, instituted 1865, to uphold the doctrines, principles, and order of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to counteract the efforts now being made to pervert her teaching on essential points of the Christian faith, or assimilate her services to those of the

Church of Rome, and further to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of spiritual religion :” the last clause having been added in 1871.

This association was not the first of its kind. The “British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation” existed in 1830, and had Mr. Wilberforce for one of its Vice-presidents. We do not know whether this was the same as “the British Reformation Society,” which was established in 1827. The latter society changed its designation subsequently to “The Protestant Reformation Society.”

Round the “Church Association” all the old champions of what was called Evangelical Protestantism speedily rallied. Nobody, indeed, could be found of sufficient worldly dignity to be invested with the office of President. But there was a long list of Vice-presidents, including the Marquis of Westmeath, five earls (Bandon, Cavan, Enniskillen, Roden, and Shrewsbury and Talbot), six other noblemen (Lord Berners, Lord Fitzwalter, Viscount Hill, Lord Leconfield, Viscount Nevill, and Lord Oranmore), four deans (Close of Carlisle, Henry Law of Gloucester, Goode of Ripon, and E. N. Hoare of Waterford), three archdeacons (Hill, Phelps, and Prest), and five members of Parliament (Messrs. Clement, Horsfall, Lefroy, Long, and Newdegate). The Chairman was John Campbell Colquhoun, Esq. : the Vice-Chairman, Thomas R. Andrews, Esq. The lay member’s annual subscription was fixed at ten shillings ; the clerical member’s, at half that sum : support being thus

sought from those classes in which vulgar, ignorant, fanatical Protestantism was most prevalent. The Council consisted of forty members, clerical and lay ; besides which there was a General Committee of fifty clergymen and as many laymen, and a large Honorary Committee. It was not necessary that any member should be a communicant : it was enough that he deemed himself a member of the Established Church.

The means by which the " Church Association " professed to carry out its ends comprised the following :— (1) Publishing information, holding public meetings, presenting memorials, &c. (2) Pressing for an authoritative disapproval and suppression of all ceremonies, vestments, and ornaments which departed from the practice of the Church as sanctioned by three centuries of usage. (3) Endeavouring to obtain such a legal decision as should prevent the continuance of doctrines and practices which, being [according to the Association] borrowed from Rome, corrupted the integrity and endangered the safety of the Reformed Church of England. (4) Assisting aggrieved parishioners to obtain protection from practices which [according to the Association] drove them from their parish church. (5) Promoting a reform of the ecclesiastical courts.—And the plan of the campaign, as made manifest by subsequent proceedings, embraced three main particulars :—(1) To make the country in general too hot for Ritualists. (2) To oust certain well-known Ritualists from their churches, or to punish them otherwise, as courts of law might order ; and so to strike terror into

others of the same party ; and with this view, on pretence that certain rubrics were of doubtful meaning, to get legal definitions promulgated in the interests of the Low-Church party. (3) The getting the Church's law altered, so that if the teaching and practice of Ritualists were in any points legal now, the same teaching and practice might in those points be made illegal for the future. Thus in 1867 the Association circulated a petition for signature which was addressed to the Queen, and a statement along with it that the "Church Association" desired to have the "Ornaments' Rubric" expunged on the ground (apparently an Irish ground) that the observance of it was repugnant to and inconsistent with that liturgy of which it formed (and still, thank God, forms) a part. This, however, the "Church Association" was content, for the most part, to leave to be effected by its sister in Protestantism, the Prayer-book Revision Society ; except so far as judges might be induced to usurp the functions of the Legislature, and to alter the law under pretence of interpreting it. Both societies were working towards the same end, the extermination of Catholic faith and Catholic worship as distinguished from Protestantism ; but they undertook to work in two different ways. The Prayer-book Revision Society refused to accept the Prayer-book as it was ; the "Church Association" pretended to accept the Prayer-book, and to be angry with the Ritualists for disobeying it. And thus, though a very few persons were members of both societies, yet for the most part it was felt that

membership in the one was morally inconsistent with membership in the other.

The action to which the "Church Association" stood committed from the very first was one of open and uncompromising hostility to the persons of Ritualistic clergy. One of their first published leaflets, an *Address of the Lay Members of the Council of the Church Association to the People of England* (on which title we shall have a remark to make by-and-by), commences thus:—"In the present paper we propose to suggest practical steps to be adopted by those whose clergymen unfortunately practise the rites and preach the doctrines of Rome.

"The test by which the laity may detect such a man is easily applied. If the clergyman calls himself a priest [a note here indicates that by "priest" is meant a *sacrificing* priest]; if he tells his people that by his priestly power he can absolve them from sin; if he says that by his priestly act he can turn the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper into the body and blood of Christ—the case is clear, we can see what he is: he is not a pastor of the Reformed Church of England; he is a priest of the Church of Rome.

"He must be treated as such. . . . Such persons must be treated as men having the plague. They must be put in quarantine, lest they infect us. If it is said that such treatment is annoying—of course; so are all precautions against disease; but though vexatious, they are needful."

This was addressed "to the people of England." Not solely to those members of the Church of Eng-

land who alone, it might be thought, had any right to hold any opinion or to take any action in such matters,—that is to say, those members of the Church who obeyed the Church's rule about communicating at least three times a year; nor even to members of the Church of England in general,—but “to the people of England,” including Dissenters of all denominations—Unitarians, Quakers, Jews, Infidels, and Atheists. And we shall see hereafter how the Church Association allowed Dissenters to join them in persecuting faithful Anglican priests.

To stir up, then, the people of England to such a course of action as that specified, tracts were published and distributed, lectures delivered, and meetings addressed by the emissaries of the Association all over the kingdom; the object being in every case to stir up bad feeling against the Ritualists. And whatever might be the advertised subject of the lecture, the lecturer was sure to attack the Ritualists before he had done. And having this bad end in view, the speakers and writers of the Association were not over-scrupulous as to what they said or wrote; and in fact they acquired a bad name for misrepresentation of truth in various ways. Sometimes the falsity was of a general character: as when it was said that the Romish priests turned their backs to the people in order to practise deception;* or, that Ritualists prayed not only to the Blessed Virgin but to a

* Lecture delivered at Wincanton in Somersetshire, April 27, 1882, by the Rev. G. Blake Concanon, and reported in the *Somerset County Mail*, May 4.

perfect host of saints, whether canonised or otherwise; * or, that they sought to crush the liberties of the laity; † or, that they only wanted an opportunity to bring the old instruments of torture into use again. ‡ Of this kind was the assertion that the Catholic Revival, so called, had been “only another name, from first to last, for a Ritualistic conspiracy, planned deliberately from the very first, for the single and sole purpose of assimilating the whole doctrine and ritual of the Protestant Church of this country to the doctrine and ritual of the Church of Rome;” § in proof of which nothing was adduced beyond a letter written originally by a Ritualistic layman, and which had been communicated to the *Union Review*. Such, again, was the libel published in the Report presented to the Association at their tenth annual meeting, and speaking of the “Ritualistic clergy” as “Romanisers” whose aim was “to blind the eyes of the public, and silence all inquiry, until the period arrives for taking over their congregations, and, if possible, the whole Church, into the arms of the Papacy.” Such, again, was the still more portentous falsehood that to the speaker’s knowledge there were, at the time then present, people in the Church of England who were receiving Protestant

* Lecture delivered at Wincanton in Somersetshire, April 27, 1882, by the Rev. G. Blake Concanon, and reported in the *Somerset County Mail*, May 4.

† *First Address of the Lay Members of the Council of the Church Association to the People of England*, p. 8.

‡ Lecture delivered at Crewe, on *Ritualism and Sacerdotalism Inconsistent with Loyalty to the Church of England*, by the Rev. Dr. Potter, cited in the *Church Times*, December 9, 1881.

§ *The True History of the Ritualistic Conspiracy*, p. 1.

pay and were at the same time doing the work of Rome, and had dispensations from the Church of Rome ; * a statement which, being challenged, the speaker was unable to substantiate. Sometimes, however, the falsehood was more particular, and of a nature to criminate the utterer with uttering it wittingly ; as when a certain Ritualistic clergyman was charged with teaching that the man who took a concoction of wafer and oil would go up to heaven, and the man who did not would go to perdition ; † or when the Editor of *The Church and the World* was charged with endeavouring to show that nominal members of the Church of England could hold all the dogmas of Rome, and observe its ritual, without changing their communion. ‡

Active and direct persecution, however, was the principal kind of weapon which the Church Association intended to use. We shall see this in detail very soon ; at present, if our narrative is to follow the order of time, we must digress a little for the purpose of noting a few occurrences which took place shortly after the Church Association was formed. For in the month of January 1867 a hundred and twenty-eight clergymen of the Diocese of Chester (which then included Liverpool) memorialised their Bishop (Dr. Jacobson) against Ritualism. The Bishop replied that if rubrical

* Statement made by the Rev. James Ormiston at a Church Association meeting held in Mr. W. H. Greening's rooms, Birmingham, December 4, 1877. The correspondence relating hereto was published in the *Church Times*, January 4, 1878. See also above, Chap. LII.

† Lecture by the Rev. G. Blake Concanon, to which reference is made above.

‡ *First Address of the Lay Members of the Council of the Church Association*, &c., p. 2.

conformity was to be insisted on, defect as well as excess would have to be condemned; thus administering an implied rebuke to the memorialists, who, it may be presumed without uncharitableness, were no better than other Low-Churchmen in the matter of obedience (or rather disobedience) to the rules of the Prayer-book. The *Christian Observer*, commenting on the Bishop's reply, asked, "Can anything be conceived more absurd than this?"* Later on in the same year more than nine thousand laymen belonging to Liverpool and the neighbourhood sent up a similar memorial. The Bishop made a similar reply to that which he had made to the clergy, suggesting also that one school of thought should give up its extravagances and the other be more hearty and exact in compliance with the directions of the Rubric; and this was stigmatised by the *Christian Observer* as "a specimen of mingled levity and self-conceit!" † A Mr. Du Boulay, writing to the Marquis of Westminster, said, "In this Diocese of Salisbury may be seen wooden frames, the gift of the Bishop, with a wooden top, six, seven, or nine feet long, standing on four, six, or eight pillars, and capable of bearing several tons weight. Now since the proper use of a Communion-table is simply to support the sacramental bread and wine, to what purposes, we may ask, were these massive frames destined?" And thereupon he called upon the laity to "watch over that ancient Standard of the Faith," their Communion-table. ‡

* *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 166.

† *Ib.* p. 743.

‡ *Ib.* pp. 166-7.

In March was held a county meeting for Dorsetshire against Ritualism, the Earl of Shaftesbury in the chair. And on the 11th of the same month the Earl of Shaftesbury introduced in the House of Lords "a bill for better enforcing uniformity in the clerical vestments and ornaments to be worn by ministers of the United Church of England and Ireland in the performance of public worship." This bill enjoined the surplice and hood (or tippet) for use in saying public prayers, and ministering sacraments and other rites of the Church, but left the black gown in the pulpit untouched. It exempted archbishops and bishops from its operation. The second reading of this bill was moved in the House of Lords on the 13th of May, but was lost.

We must now, however, come back to the "Church Association." They were proposing, as we have already remarked, to bring active and direct persecution to bear upon the Ritualist clergy; and with this view, in 1867, a "Guarantee Fund" was opened to enable the Council to assist parishioners who might apply to them for advice and expenses of appeals to the Law Courts undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the law on any point involving what the Council called Romanising doctrines or Ritualistic practices. The amount asked for on this behalf was originally £10,000, and afterwards £50,000, which last sum, and more besides, was soon promised, and in due time paid.

In this same year (1867) a memorial signed by twenty-one Anglican priests, and expressing, both negatively and positively, their belief as to the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic

Sacrifice, was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley). Hereupon the "Church Association" got up a counter-declaration, and made, in their next annual report, the audacious statement that the views expressed by the twenty-one clergymen not only "were never held by any divine of any mark in England, whether of the High-Church or Low-Church school," but were "simply borrowed, without acknowledgment, from the Church of Rome." The counter-declaration protested especially against the following doctrines:—That the Supper of the Lord is a Propitiatory Sacrifice; that the Body and Blood of Christ are objectively present in the Elements; that all who partake of the Elements receive the Body of Christ; that clergymen are sacrificing Priests; that they possess judicial authority to forgive sin, and that the forgiveness of sin is not complete without priestly absolution; that the clergy are authorised to receive confessions as an habitual part of religious practice, and to give formal absolution from sin; and that Christ is to be adored as personally present in the Elements.*

An attempt was made, too, in the spring, on the part of Archdeacon Jacob of Winchester and some Rural Deans, to get up an address to the Bishop of Winchester from the clergy of his diocese, charging some of their clerical brethren with attempting to introduce, "under cover of an elaborate

* The reader will bear in mind that, in quoting the language of the "Church Association," we do not bind ourselves to an approval of it as an accurate expression of the views of Catholic divines; *e.g.* the epithet "propitiatory" would need qualification or explanation, lest it should be taken in a wrong sense.

Ritualism, some of the most pernicious errors of the Church of Rome," and with having defiantly adopted practices of an undeniably Roman character."* In the summer the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring) inhibited the Bishop-coadjutor of Edinburgh from officiating in the Durham Diocese, and deprived the Hon. and Rev. Francis Richard Grey, Rector of Morpeth, of the office of Rural Dean; the reason of this action being that the Bishop-coadjutor had commenced a sermon with the Invocation, and the Rural Dean had worn a black stole with three crosses embroidered on it. It was, too, we believe, in this same year that the Rev. James Ormiston, afterwards an influential member of the Church Association, did an act of aggressive Protestantism by insulting a Ritualistic clergyman while in the exercise of his ministry in his own church. At a time when the Rev. Alexander Heriot Mackonochie, Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, was sitting in his vestry to hear confessions, Mr. Ormiston placed himself among those who were waiting to go in, thus pretending that he, like the rest, wanted spiritual consolation or other pastoral ministry. When his turn came he went into the vestry and, instead of making any real confession of sin or bringing up any spiritual burden at all, proceeded to read from a paper a kind of protest against Catholic practices. Of course he was speedily stopped, but had the effrontery to ask for absolution before leaving the vestry. On the matter being reported to the Bishop the latter required Mr. Ormiston to apo-

* *Church News*, March 20, 1867.

logise, and Mr. Ormiston did apologise accordingly, and at least one leading Low-Churchman, the Rev. Daniel Wilson, Vicar of Islington, expressed disapprobation of his conduct. He does not, however, seem to have repented of his profane impertinence, for he afterwards wrote to the *Constitution* in these terms :—“ Let the uproar, slander, and persecution which my late effort to unmask the demoralising Ritualistic confessional of St. Alban's, Holborn, has produced, witness to the low state of religious morality in our day. From all points of the ecclesiastical compass the storm-winds of wrath and disapprobation have vented their strength. But what of it all? The word of covenant-promise stands firm: ‘No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.’” In writing thus Mr. Ormiston gave a striking illustration of the way in which Low-Church people could pervert Scripture, under the blinding influence of self-conceit or party-conceit; of which also his conduct gives a remarkable instance.

In this year a long correspondence took place between the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley) and a Mr. Weld, who claimed, though on doubtful grounds, to be churchwarden of Folkestone. In this correspondence Mr. Weld complained of altar-cross, candlesticks, re-table, floral decorations, and some other things; also that the Curate elevated the elements and used the mixed chalice. In September the services at St. Matthias', Stoke Newington, were attended by persons con-

nected with the Protestant Institute, who sought by various antics to cast ridicule upon the ritual of that church. One produced a maniple, which he used repeatedly as a pocket-handkerchief. He was turned out, and then with his accomplices assembled a mob outside, which went to the house of Mr. Brett, the churchwarden, and broke the windows.*

The chief business, however, of the year was the commencement of the regular set persecution; which we will begin in the next chapter to relate.

In the same year an attempt was made on the part of the Government to allay the bitter feeling which the revival of Catholic ritual had excited throughout the Church. A Royal Commission was appointed to examine into the subject, with a view to explaining or amending the rubrical directions in the Prayer-book. The Commission, however, did not find favour in Low-Church eyes. The majority was composed of High-Churchmen; unfortunately, perhaps, but necessarily, inasmuch as High-Churchmen were the only people, generally speaking, who had any real knowledge of the matters to be considered: and therefore, of course, Low-Churchmen were ready to see enormities in all the Commissioners' proceedings. We shall see hereafter how those proceedings ended.

* *Church News*, October 2 and 16, 1867.

CHAPTER LVI.

Immoral Period, continued. Commencement of Systematic Persecution in the Case of the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie: approved by the Low-Church Party generally. Visitation-charge of Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury: consequent Opposition: Meetings and Petitions. Ritual Commission. Low-Church Dishonesty. Pan-Anglican Conference. Low-Church Promotions. Further Proceedings against Mr. Mackonochie. Paid Spies.

“These are the things that ye shall do; speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates: and let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, saith the LORD.”—ZECHARIAH viii. 16, 17.

WE are to relate in the present chapter the commencement of the systematic persecution of Catholics in the Church of England. And as we proceed we are to have before our minds the strange spectacle of a Church established by law, and whose rules as to public worship were enforced by the strictest subscriptions, and one party in it notoriously defective in its obedience to those rules, and yet persecuting another party for alleged excesses in regard of the same, and those in authority not only winking at the defect, but punishing the excessive obedience. And we shall see hereafter how the persecution was carried as far as to the infliction of ruinous costs, the despoiling of goods, and the imprisonment of persons.

Here it may be well to consider a question which will not fail to occur as we go on, viz. Had these proceedings the concurrence of the Low-Church party in general? or was the Low-Church party split up from this time into two camps, one holding

with the persecutors, and the other not? In answer to this it must be said that, with a very few exceptions, the "Church Association" had at this time, and for almost the whole period with which the present narrative is concerned, the tacit assent and concurrence of the whole Low-Church party. One lecture, indeed, which appears to have been unusually virulent, occasioned one clergyman who had heard it to write to the Secretary of the local branch of the Association, saying that he could not go to bed until he had written to say that he must place his charity above his Protestantism, and resign his position in a branch that could allow so uncharitable and unchristian a lecture to be delivered.* Another member withdrew on the ground that his membership brought him into contact with such a disreputable and drunken set of men. The correspondent of the *Church Times*, who stated this of his own knowledge, added, "I know of worse charges that might be brought against some of these godly defenders of the Protestant religion." † At a later period, too, when the proceedings of the Association had been of a more scandalous character than before, a protest was raised by the *Record*, and several more withdrawals from the Association took place. In general, however, Low-Churchmen allowed the main part of the work done by the Association, however they might disapprove of some of the details. They did not wish to soil

* The clergyman was the Rev. Henry Bolland, Vicar of St. James's, Wolverhampton, in which town the lecture in question had been delivered by the Rev. Dr. Wainwright. The incident is mentioned in *My Prosecution*, by the Rev. R. W. Enraght, p. 8.

† *Church Times*, January 10, 1879.

their own fingers, but they were well content that others, with whose principles they fully sympathised, should soil theirs in persecuting the common foe.

We have seen that the "Church Association" had secured promises of over £50,000 to guarantee whatever costs they might incur in their pious and charitable work. Being thus ensured, as far as might be, against bankruptcy, the Association lost no time in getting to action; and not without invoking the Divine blessing—somewhat as we have heard concerning a leader of brigands, who, being himself a reader in the Orthodox Eastern Church, would not set out in the exercise of his calling until he had recited with his troops the office for the day.*

* By the Constitution of the Association it was ordered that the meetings both of the Council and of committees should always be opened with prayer. In case any reader should desire to know the kind of supplications which the Council deemed fit for putting up, we transcribe a few passages from the form of prayer used at the opening of the Church Association Conference, November 26, 1867. (It would seem that the prohibition of the Book of Common Prayer in the times of Puritan supremacy was not considered by the Council any infringement of religious liberty.) "We have been permitted through Thy gracious Providence, now for three centuries, to enjoy as a Church the inestimable privilege of religious liberty. . . . And now, Lord, what shall we say? We are ashamed to lift up our faces before Thee. Fatal errors are propagated in our midst which threaten the existence of our Reformed Church. False brethren have crept in among us, who are setting at defiance her recognised doctrines, and would bring us again under the yoke of spiritual bondage. Our eyes are turned unto Thee. We desire to commit our cause into Thy hand. . . . Bless the means which are now adopted for the exposure of error. Grant Thy blessings to the counsels of the Church Association, that it may maintain the Truth among us. May we have a single eye to Thy glory. May no party feelings mar our work. . . . The enemy is bold and daring, but Thy power is all-sufficient to restrain. . . . And now, Lord, behold their threatenings" (!), &c.

Who should be the first object of attack? or rather (as Church Associationist-speakers attempted more than once to make the public believe) of self-defence? Several circumstances marked out the Rev. Alexander Heriot Mackonochie, Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, as peculiarly eligible. He had signed the memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Eucharistic doctrine; his church was in a central part of London, and had eclipsed for the time the Church of St. Matthias, Stoke Newington, as that had eclipsed All Saints', Margaret Street, and as All Saints', Margaret Street, had eclipsed St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas's, Pimlico. The endowment of the living was not more than £150 a year, with a house for the Vicar and two Curates, each of which Curates had £100 a year by gift of the founder, the Hon. J. G. Hubbard; and it was yet to be seen whether Mr. Mackonochie and his friends would be able to match the Church Association in point of funds. Such considerations may well have influenced the Council of the Association in determining, as they did, after prayer, to commence proceedings against him. Not, however, with any feelings of envy, or hatred, or malice, or any uncharitableness against the man; oh no! those holy and righteous people who undertook to prosecute him were actuated solely by a desire to have the law defined; of this the public were assured on the authority of the "Church Association" itself, and could anything be more satisfactory?*

* Mr. Martin afterwards wrote to the Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson) in these terms:—"It was understood when proceedings were originally taken that their object was simply to ascertain

And if anybody had hinted mildly that the clerical members of the Association, or some of them, were in the habit of violating a great many laws of the Church even then, the reply was ready to hand. What High-Churchman has ever prosecuted a Low-Church brother for any alleged breach of the Church's law? So that the question whether any rubric was or was not to be obeyed in the way in which High-Churchmen obey it—*e.g.* whether the black gown might be worn by a preacher in the middle of the Communion-service, or whether the Athanasian Creed might be omitted from Morning Prayer on the Feast of St. Matthias, or whether the Offertory sentences and Prayer for the Church Militant might be omitted on a Sunday when there was no communion—had never been even raised. Unfortunately, however, there was the possibility of a lawsuit being undertaken on an amicable understanding, each side agreeing to pay its own costs; and the fact that of this possibility the Council of the "Church Association" uniformly forbore to avail themselves proved that every profession made by them of a mere desire to ascertain the requirements of the law was an utter falsehood.

The prosecution of Mr. Mackonochie was to be conducted "at the sole expense and under the supervision" of the "Church Association." * Who

authoritatively the law of the Church on certain points, which, when ascertained, would be acquiesced in on both sides and obeyed" (*Church Times*, June 25, 1880). Mr. Martin no doubt believed so, but the "Church Association" very soon made it plain that, if that had been their sole object at first, it did not continue their sole object very long.

* *Annual Report* of the "Church Association," 1867, p. 22.

should be the nominal prosecutor? who should be the Aggrieved Parishioner, not to be turned away from his Parish Church on every vain protest which might turn up, but whose conscience, faithful to the Protestant traditions of the Anglican Church, and offended at the Romish ceremonial which he was compelled to witness Sunday after Sunday, and especially when he received the Holy Communion at the hands of his parochial clergy, should have fled for refuge, of his own accord, to the Guarantee Fund of the "Church Association?" The person originally selected by the Council to act this character died suddenly; another parishioner therefore had to be proposed to the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) as the promoter of the intended suit instead of the deceased. Eventually a person named John Martin was found; he did not reside within the parish of St. Alban's, and therefore was not legally a parishioner; but he was secretary to some schools situated within the parish, and his name, consequently, was on the parish rate-book: and him the Bishop deemed suitable. It may seem strange to the non-legal mind that the Bishop, who was to be to a certain extent a judge in these proceedings, should be asked for an opinion on such a subject, or, if asked, should give one; but when Dr. Tait had been promoted to the See of London he said, as was stated by his then principal chaplain, that if he held the see ten years he would not leave a Puseyite in it.* Thus Mr. Martin was induced (although, as he afterwards said, reluctantly) to sign a document giving the "Church Association" power

* *Church Times* correspondent, October 18, 1878.

to use his name in the suit which was really theirs, they, on the other hand, undertaking to indemnify him in any costs which might be incurred; * and on the 28th of March, 1867, the Bishop, having received, nominally from Mr. Martin, a paper of charges against Mr. Mackonochie, sent letters of request to the Court of Arches, under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Act, that the case might be tried in that court. The charges preferred were four in number :—(1) The elevation, during or after the Prayer of Consecration in the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion, of the paten and cup, and the kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements; (2) using lighted candles on the Communion-table during the celebration of the Holy Communion, when such candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light; (3) using incense in the celebration of the Holy Communion; and (4) mixing water with the wine used in the administration of the Holy Communion.

The hearing of the case commenced June 15 before Dr. Lushington, and proceeded on the 4th of the following December before Sir Robert Phillimore.

Meanwhile the Protestant opposition to Catholic doctrine was stirred into greater activity by the Visitation-charge delivered by the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Walter Kerr Hamilton), first at Bridport, on the 16th of May. This charge was mainly devoted to a statement and vindication of the following doctrines :—(1) That certain men had

* Statement in the *World*, cited in the *Church Times*, June 25, 1880.

had entrusted to them by God, as fellow-workers with Him, supernatural powers and prerogatives ; (2) that God has been pleased to give to them, His ministers, the power of so altering the elements of bread and wine as to make them the channels of conveying to the soul for its subsistence the refreshing Body and Blood of Christ ; (3) that as Christ, the ascended Lord, is ever pleading, so the clergy, His ministers, plead on earth that which He pleads in heaven ; and (4) that God, who alone can forgive sins, had delegated to them, His representatives, the power and authority of expressing to those who were fit to receive it the pardon of their sins. The Bishop proceeded to say that there was a time to speak as well as a time to keep silence ; and that he believed the time for being outspoken to have arrived in his diocese, and he had acted on that occasion, God knew, agreeably to his conviction, and without any mental reserve. "At this point," says the printed report,* "the Rev. William C. Templer, the Rector of Burton Bradstock, stepped from his seat into the aisle, in front of his Lordship, and exclaimed with much fervour, 'I believe there is a time to speak and a time to be silent ; let those that are on the Lord's side follow me,' and he turned and walked out of the church, followed by one churchwarden. This scene created a profound impression, and his Lordship was for a moment apparently much disconcerted. Intense silence prevailed for a minute or two, and then his Lordship said, 'I would only remind you that this is a court, and the clergy are

* Cited in the *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 498.

bound to attend it, though their consciences are not bound to receive all they hear. Of course a person may be punished for any contempt of court.' He then proceeded with the reading of his Charge; but before he had concluded, though he omitted what, he said, would occupy several hours reading, every churchwarden had left the church, and the clergy manifested signs of weariness. In the afternoon the churchwardens held a meeting, and unanimously adopted the following address to the Bishop, which was signed by thirty-four of them: 'My Lord,—As churchwardens of the several parishes within your diocese, we have this day attended your triennial visitation, and heard the Charge delivered by you to your clergy. Feeling that we have also responsible duties to perform, in endeavouring to preserve our Reformed Church from innovations and practices inimical to its pure faith, we avail ourselves of the occasion to express our deep regret at some of the opinions and doctrines therein enunciated. We believe them to be at variance with those principles for which our forefathers so nobly and successfully struggled more than three hundred years ago, when they protested against the errors of the Church of Rome. Entertaining the highest possible respect for your Lordship's personal character and office, we nevertheless feel it incumbent on us to assert our belief that unless a check is at once and promptly made, both by clergy and laity, to those innovations and practices which are alien to the feelings of all sound Churchmen, a considerable portion of those who are now sincerely devoted to

the Establishment will be induced to withdraw to Dissenting places of worship, or be insidiously attracted towards the Church of Rome, and thereby destroy the harmony and weaken the confidence which has [*sic*] so long and happily existed amongst them.'” Apparently it did not occur to these wiseacres that the failure to impose a check, promptly and at once, upon the innovations and practices in question might cause a considerable number of Churchpeople to become Dissenters or Romanists, and yet that the innovations in doctrine might be perfectly true, and the practices perfectly right, and in accordance with the Prayer-book.

Seventy clergymen of the Diocese of Salisbury appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury against their diocesan in consequence of his Charge; * but nothing, for aught that we have heard, ever came of this appeal. The opposition, however, which was raised generally against him by the Low-Churchmen of his diocese caused the Bishop a great deal of distress and anxiety, and was thus the means of hastening his decease, which took place about two years later † A principal leader in the opposition was the Rev. Lord Sydney Godolphin Osborne, Rector of Durweston-with-Bryanston. This priest had not been always careful to maintain the professional dignity of his clerical position, and doubtless felt specially aggrieved at hearing it publicly declared by his bishop that every priest was responsible for the exercise of supernatural powers.

* *Life of Bishop Gray of Capetown*, vol. ii. p. 336.

† August 1, 1869.

In the November of this year (1867) there was an extraordinary meeting of Parliament; and Lord Portman presented a petition from more than 3,000 people in the Diocese of Salisbury, *Protestants of different denominations*, protesting against the doctrines stated in the Bishop's Charge, and praying for the establishment of a tribunal by which the doctrines might be *considered*.* On the 3rd of the preceding June the Government had endeavoured to allay the excitement by appointing a Commission "to inquire into the rubrics, orders, and directions for regulating the course and conduct of public worship, &c., according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland," "and more especially with reference to the ornaments used in the churches and chapels of the said United Church, and the vestments worn by the ministers thereof." The first report of the Commission is dated the 19th of the following August. In it, speaking of the vestments lately introduced into certain churches, they said: "We find that while these vestments are regarded by some witnesses as symbolical of doctrine, and by others as a distinctive vesture whereby they desire to do honour to the Holy Communion as the

* *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 994. This, we presume, was the petition concerning which a correspondent in the *Church News* detailed some particulars which did not increase its moral weight. One person to whom a copy of it was brought for signature noted, among the twenty-six names which that copy bore, *three* of persons whose religion might be anything or nothing, and some which had been inserted without the knowledge of their owners. There were only *five* names of communicants, and six of persons in the habit of coming to church more or less regularly. *Church News*, December 11, 1867.

highest act of Christian worship, they are by none regarded as essential, and they give grave offence to many ;” and added, “ We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the United Church of England and Ireland all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said United Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress.” From this report ten Commissioners dissented on various grounds. The third report proposed that revision of the Lectionary which has now been made by Act of Parliament to supersede that in the Prayer-book of 1862. This report, dated January 12, 1870, was signed by all the Commissioners, Sir Joseph Napier alone appending a note that his signature was to be taken with a certain qualification, which he specified. In so far as the Commissioners had discussed the subject of ornaments and vestments, no other result was obtained save the demonstration of the impossibility of compromise between the two principal contending parties in the Church.

We ought to state that on the appointment of the Commission a few clergymen memorialised the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley), intimating their desire that no alteration in the Prayer-book which the Commissioners had proposed might be made by Parliament till sanctioned by Convocation. The Archbishop agreed with these, and assured them that Convocation would be duly consulted. This reply the *Christian Observer* con-

sidered as alarming and indecent ;* and the Earl of Shaftesbury asked the Archbishop in the House of Lords (June 8) what his authority for giving it had been. The Archbishop answered that his authority was law and precedent.

The dishonesty, conscious or unconscious, of some among the Low-Church party appeared this year, in the opening of "free churches" in various parts of the country where the parochial clergy were Ritualistic ; for the promoters of these, while professing attachment to the Church of England, and expressing themselves as anxious to obtain the services of "pious clergymen," as they called them—that is to say, of Low-Churchmen who had been regularly ordained—did yet, in their use of the Prayer-book, adopt various alterations and omissions, and, when they could not get a "pious clergyman," were content with the ministrations of a Dissenter.† It may be remarked, too, that when the members of the congregation of Surrey Chapel kept their eighty-fourth anniversary, which they did this year, the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Hon. Arthur Kinnaird were among the speakers who assisted in doing honour to the occasion. Surrey Chapel, it will be remembered, had been built for the Rev. Rowland Hill, independently of the Established Church, and was a Nonconformist meeting-house.

* *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 661.

† *Ib.*, p. 823. John Deverell, Esq., of Farlington, Hants, admitted to the Ritual Commissioners in that year that he had built a chapel "for members of the Church of England protesting in self-defence against the Romanising principles and practices as carried out in" his locality. A Dissenter was appointed to officiate, he being willing to use the Church-services. But the Athanasian Creed was never said.

The September of this year (1867) was remarkable for the assembling of the first Pan-Anglican Conference, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. How this Conference originated is thus told by the Rev. T. Bedford Jones, Chaplain to the Bishop of Ontario (Dr. Lewis). "Some time in the year 1864 I was walking with the Bishop of Ontario near the city of Kingston, in his diocese, and the conversation turned upon the condition and prospects of our Anglican communion. The Bishop on that occasion unfolded his cherished plan to effect, what we both desired, the consolidation of the Church, the union of Christendom. The plan was first to secure a meeting of all the English and Colonial bishops; after this, as the next step, to invite the American prelates to a second meeting; and he thought that if such a conference or council could by any good fortune be brought about, that then, as a third step, representations of other Catholic communions might come to unite their strength with us, and so at last Rome might be faced by a compact body, a great council of Catholics, which she should respect before the world, and so be forced to come to terms. I remember how the scheme was discussed by the Bishop and myself, and finally dismissed as almost utopian. However, the following year (1865), just prior to the meeting of the Provincial Synod of Montreal, the Bishop of Ontario again mentioned the subject of our conversations, and told me that he was about, after much consideration, to bring it forward in the House of Bishops; and I remember perfectly the doubt he entertained about the success of his intended pro-

position, which was to petition the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon a meeting of the bishops of the Anglican Communion. And I am able to state, as a matter of fact, that the resolution embodying this proposition was actually drawn up at Cornwall, on the Bishop's way to Montreal, in the house of the late Archdeacon Patton. This, I believe, the Archdeacon himself stated in a letter to the *Guardian* in September 1867. The Provincial Synod of 1865 met. The bishops sat by themselves. There were then but five forming 'the House,' and of these five the Bishop of Ontario alone survives. Therefore it can now do no harm to anyone to say that on the breaking up of the Synod on one of the days of meeting, the Bishop of Ontario joined me outside the hall, and said, 'Well, I had hard work to get that through our house. They all pool-pooled it at first and said we should only be laughed at; so I had to stand up (which is a thing we never do) and make a speech to my four brethren of twenty minutes. And then the Metropolitan said, "Well, it can do no harm at all events," and so the memorial was finally carried unanimously.'

"Soon after this Dr. Lewis had a most serious illness, which made him an invalid for a considerable portion of the year 1866. He was ordered to England for change of climate during the hot summer months, and here he had frequent interviews with Archbishop Longley, the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), and others. Bishop Selwyn was then in New Zealand, and Bishop Gray was at Capetown; and although the idea may have passed

through their minds, they had nothing whatever to do with the utterance of it, nor the passing of it into action. The result of the Canadian Memorial and of Dr. Lewis's conferences with the Archbishop and bishops in 1866 was, that the first Pan-Anglican Conference was summoned." *

Every bishop of the Anglican Communion was invited by the Archbishop to the Conference; and the invitation brought together 18 English prelates, 5 Irish, 6 Scottish, 24 Colonial, 4 ex-Colonial, and 19 American. They met to deliberate on the best way of promoting the Re-union of Christendom—the notification of the establishment of new sees—letters commendatory from clergymen and laymen passing to distant dioceses—subordination in our Colonial Church to Metropolitans—discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans—court of the Metropolitan—question of appeal—conditions of union with the Church at home—notification of proposed missionary bishoprics—subordination of missionaries: † matters, we should have thought, of interest to the whole Church. As, however, Low-Churchmen were not the only ones present—and, indeed, two Low-Churchmen, the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), and the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring), had, we believe, formally declined the invitation—everything connected with the Conference was, to the mind of the *Christian Observer*, exceedingly painful.‡

* *Church Times*, August 30, 1878, p. 480.

† *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth Palace*, September 24-27, 1867 (Rivington), p. 9.

‡ *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 903.

We must now, however, come back to the "Church Association," and the formal persecution which it had commenced. Besides the case in which the victim was Mr. Mackonochie, another Ritual case had come on about the same time, viz. that known as *Flamank v. Simpson*. In this Mr. Thomas Flamank, churchwarden of the parish of East Teignmouth, Devon, prosecuted the Rev. Thomas Burne Simpson, Perpetual Curate of the same parish, on several charges. The case was not under the control of the "Church Association," but aid was given by the Association in support of it.* Mr. Simpson was prosecuted for using lighted candles at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, using the mixed chalice, elevating the paten and chalice above his head after consecration, placing the alms on a stool and not on the Holy Table, and wilfully omitting the word "all" from the Benedictory Prayer at Mattins and Evensong. The last charge shows the animus of the prosecutor, anxious to get an adversary punished as much as possible. It was denied by the defendant, and abandoned by the prosecutor. The defendant admitted that he had elevated the elements while proceeding with the consecration-prayer. The other charges also were admitted by him; though as to placing the alms on a stool, he denied that he had done it with any other view than to obtain more room upon the altar.

The matter was brought, in the first place, before the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts), who sent the case to the Court of Arches by letters of request;

* *Annual Report of the Church Association, 1867, p. 22.*

and that court sat to hear it on February 5, 1868, Sir Robert Phillimore, Dean of Arches, presiding. The arguments occupied three days; and on March 28, 1868, judgment was delivered by him both in this case and in that of Mr. Mackonochie. In each case the decision was that the elevation, as charged by the promoters, was illegal; the use of two lights legal; and the mixing of the chalice in time of Divine Service illegal. As to placing the alms on the stool, Mr. Simpson admitted that he had done wrong, and submitted to the judgment of the court. Mr. Mackonochie was admonished not to recur to two practices, already discontinued by him under protest, of censuring persons and things, and elevating the Sacrament, and to abstain from mixing the chalice in time of Divine Service. Kneeling, however, in the course of the consecration-prayer was not deemed illegal. As to costs, Mr. Simpson was to pay £80 *nomine expensarum*; while no order was made in the case of Mr. Mackonochie.

The same year (1868) saw some more promotions in the Low-Church interest. Dr. Tait was translated to the see of Canterbury on the decease of Archbishop Longley; and was succeeded in that of London by Dr. Jackson of Lincoln; who, while Bishop of Lincoln, had scattered a congregation gathered from among Dissenters and heretics, telling the priest whom he was inhibiting that they must go where they had come from at first rather than be tolerated in some points of Catholic ritual. Canon Champneys, a member of the "Church Association" at its original formation, was made Dean of Lichfield. Another influential member of

the Association was sent to the Deanery of Ripon. This was the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, D.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Liverpool, and Canon of Chester. His appointment gave occasion for the following epigram in the *Church Times* :—

“ High in the scale thy Deans, O Ripon, stand !
 High in the scale as any in the land !
 Thy last was Goode, and now propitious fate
 Sends thee a Dean who is both good and great.”

In explanation of which it is to be observed that while Dr. M'Neile was still at Liverpool, the Editor of the *Church Times* received one day a letter about some matter of ecclesiastical patronage, and in which the writer spoke of Dr. M'Neile as “ a great and good man.” The letter was anonymous, but the Editor (who had seen Dr. M'Neile's handwriting before) thought that he recognised in it the hand of the rev. Doctor himself, and said so in print. Dr. M'Neile's friends were very indignant at the imputation ; but the Editor did not retract the avowal of his belief ; and the Doctor himself preserved a strict silence on the matter ; until at a public meeting some allusion to the matter was made by one of the speakers, whereof the Doctor could not avoid taking some notice, and he thereupon got up and acknowledged having written the letter. It is characteristic of the Low-Church party that this acknowledgment was received with cheers. *A propos* of the Doctor's advancement, it might have been thought that a man who could deliberately write himself down as “ great and good ” was not exactly the man to be preferred above others in the way of promotion,

especially promotion in the Church ; considering the words in the Gospel, " Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased." Mr. Disraeli, however, thought otherwise, and Dr. McNeile became Dean of Ripon : retaining the nickname of " great and good " to the last.

We must now revert to the persecution of Mr. Mackonochie. The " Church Association " were not well pleased either at having the Eucharistic lights pronounced legal, or that a man should be ruled as within the law if he knelt down at the time of consecration ; and therefore they appealed from the judgment of Sir Robert Phillimore to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. On the 17th and following days of November in this same year (1868) the case was heard ; and on the 23rd of December, two days before Christmas Day, Earl Cairns, Lord High Chancellor, delivered judgment. With regard to this there are certain facts which an impartial historian cannot pass over in silence. The Earl of Derby had resigned the office of Premier in the early part of the year, and had been succeeded by Mr. Disraeli (afterwards Earl of Beaconsfield); and in November there occurred a general election. The Ministry, says Mr. J. D. Chambers, Recorder of Salisbury, " had chosen to raise an ultra-Protestant cry. It soon became apparent that this watchword would fail, and that the Administration was doomed to fall. In this state of things, the appeal in the St. Alban's case was advanced, out of its turn, from the bottom of a long list to the head of the same ; and although in the ordinary course it

could not have been taken till late in 1869, it was forced to a hearing first." * It behoved the Presbyterian Lord Chancellor to select members of the Privy Council to try it; and when the selection had been made, the list stood thus:—Earl Cairns, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Westbury, Sir William Erle, Sir J. W. Colville, and the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson). The remark was thus provoked that the list included “a Presbyterian, an ex-representative of the Orange town of Belfast, a partisan archbishop, a lay Low-Churchman, and a theologian [Lord Westbury] who talks about ‘the inferior Persons of the Trinity.’” Here was a court to adjudicate upon the ritual of the Church of England, and to review a judgment pronounced by so learned an ecclesiastical judge as Sir Robert Phillimore!

The judgment on the appeal was delivered December 28, 1868. It proceeded upon the assumption that the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer were exhaustive, and to be regarded as forbidding everything which they did not expressly enjoin. Mr. Mackonochie was condemned on all the points; and was, moreover, saddled with all the costs, although four out of six points had been decided in his favour by the court below, and the nominal promoter of the suit was not legally a parishioner—which last consideration had, in the suit of *Liddell v. Beal*, led the Judicial Committee in 1860 to decide differently. It was no new thing,

* *Strictures on the Judgment of the Court of Appeal in the Case of Martin v. Mackonochie*, cited in *The Church in Baldwin's Gardens*, p. 31.

however, for the Judicial Committee to decide in opposition to precedent and former decisions.

The judgment was confirmed January 14, 1869, and on the 19th of the same month a monition was issued from her Majesty's Court of Appeal ordering Mr. Mackonochie to govern himself accordingly. With this monition he complied; ceasing to burn altar-lights at a celebration, ceasing to elevate the paten and chalice above his head, and ceasing to kneel in the interval between the consecration of the two several kinds. He continued, however, to burn lights at Mattins, and instead of kneeling in time of consecration he genuflected; and this gave occasion to Mr. Martin, acting as agent of the "Church Association," to come before the Privy Council with the information that Mr. Mackonochie had disobeyed their monition. The Privy Council ruled that to bend the knee was kneeling, in the eye of the law, even though the knee might not touch the ground, and condemned Mr. Mackonochie accordingly; and although acquitting him on each of Mr. Martin's other two charges, they nevertheless ordered him again to pay all the costs.

Ten days after the delivery of this supplemental judgment (so to call it), spies were sent by the "Church Association" to St. Alban's Church; and they continued to attend the church on various Sundays in December 1869, and in the following January and February. Had the pious members of the Association Council been asked individually whether they deemed it generally right to go to church for the purpose of looking about, they would probably have said "No." The *Christian*

Observer had expressed the opinion in 1838 that "persons in church ought to be employed in worshipping God, and not in noting the gestures of the priest." * Now, however, that the prosecution of a Ritualist was to be set forward, all such principles were put out of sight; and an association formed for the purpose of promoting spiritual religion arranged that on recurrences of that Day whereof Dr. Watts had taught children to sing—

"To-day with pleasure Christians meet
To pray and hear Thy word,"

certain persons should attend solemn services at St. Alban's Church, not for purposes of prayer, or of receiving Christian instruction, but solely that they might be able to make, for hire, affidavits that the officiating clergy had done or not done such and such things.

On the 26th of March, 1870, the Judicial Committee, consisting of the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley), the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), and Lord Chelmsford, sat to hear what these persons had to say. Their affidavits were brought up; and affidavits of other persons as well. What was the evidence? Had the elements been elevated above the head? The three hired spies swore that they had; three clergymen and the two churchwardens, on the other hand, swore that they had not. Had the defendant knelt in the course of the prayer of consecration? The hired spies said "Yes;" Mr. Mackonochie said "No," and he was corroborated by three clergymen, a barrister, and

* *Christian Observer* for 1838, p. 177.

a solicitor. Judgment was given by Lord Chelmsford towards the end of 1870. The court found that kneeling as alleged was not proved, but that Mr. Mackonochie had sanctioned elevation: the Judges thus accepting the evidence of the hired spies, and rejecting the contradictory evidence of the clergymen and the lawyers. This too, we believe, was the occasion on which the court was obliged to acknowledge that the elevation condemned had been only an elevation of the rim of the cup, and that even that had been done by the curate "unintentionally and unconsciously." The court also found Mr. Mackonochie guilty of sanctioning prostration—an offence with which he had not been charged in the Articles. For the court held that bowing was, in the eye of the law, a kind of kneeling; and in the present case, said Lord Chelmsford, it was "not a mere bow, but a humble prostration of the body in reverence and adoration," thus implying that it was the humility, the reverence, and the adoration which made Mr. Mackonochie's act, otherwise allowable, to be illegal and worthy of punishment. And the sentence was that Mr. Mackonochie should be suspended for three months.

To this judgment Mr. Mackonochie deemed it his duty to submit, and submitted accordingly. The bill of costs (which he had to pay) included the following items, among many others of a like kind:—

<i>"July, 1869.</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
Attending Mr. Pond: instructing him to attend	
St. Alban's on Sunday, July 11th . . .	0 6 8
Taking his statement and fair copy . . .	0 18 4
Paid him for his attendance	2 2 0

Attending Mr. Pond ; instructing him to attend the early Communion on July 12th (<i>i.e.</i> the next day, Monday) and four following days .	£	s.	d.
	0	6	8
Taking his statement and fair copy	0	18	4
Paid him for his attendance	5	5	0

CHAPTER LVII.

Immoral Period, continued. Commencement of the *Rock*. Proprietary Chapels. Persecution of the Rev. John Purchas.

“They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity.”
—MICAH iii. 10.

WE must now, however, turn our eyes away from St. Alban's, Holborn, to see what had been doing by the Low-Church party in other parts of London and in the country.

In the early part of the year 1868 was started the *Rock* newspaper, from the publishing-office of Messrs. Collingridge. It was designated “a Church of England family newspaper, on sound National principles ;” it received the support of many Low-Church leaders, and it came out every Tuesday and Friday at the price of one penny. It soon earned for itself the sobriquet of “The Penny Punch,” so vastly amusing was it. This was by reason of the ignorance, stupidity, and fanaticism which it displayed in dealing with religious matters; for it became a quasi-organ of the “Church Association,” and showed itself in every way worthy of its connexion with that society. Of the amount of churchmanship possessed by the Editor an indication was given in a remark which

appeared in one number, where, criticising adversely some Ritualistic precept or recommendation, it took for granted that the words "O come, let us worship and fall down, and kneel before the *Lord our Maker*" occurred in the *Magnificat*, and that presently, after hearing them or joining in them, the congregation seated themselves to hear a Lesson read, and that Lesson the First. Dr. Pusey mentioned his having been assured by a Romanist correspondent that some of the bitterest articles in two newspapers (the *Rock*, apparently, one, and the *Daily Telegraph* the other) had been written by Romanists in the Romanist interest, for the purpose of making the Church of England too hot for the Ritualists. And certainly that was not the only way in which the new ultra-Low-Church paper laid itself open to the suspicion of having been tampered with by Romanists. A powerful anti-Papal article appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review* for 1878. The *Rock*, which had been always opposed to that periodical, and eager to represent it as secretly Romanist, said nothing at all about this article, although the first and longest in the number, while noticing, and commenting upon all or almost all of the rest. This was pointed out by a correspondent of the *Church Times*; and in a reply the Editor of the *Rock* said that it had "never ceased to *recommend Rome* as the proper port for which the Puseyite crew ought to steer their rickety bark. Submission to Rome *would not add to their heresy*, while it would remove their inconsistency. At the same time we are well aware that *such is not the object of the wire-*

pullers of the party. What the Puseyites really desire—so old Stanley Faber said nigh forty years ago—is not *submission* to Rome, but *full Catholic communion with her.*” On which the *Church Times*’ correspondent, Mr. P. H. Vivian, remarked, “As submission to Rome now means the acceptance of the Vatican decrees on the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, it follows that the *Rock* does not think these doctrines heretical, but either absolutely unimportant, or else true, and, if true, Divine.” And as to the *Rock*’s confession that the Ritualist leaders did not wish at all to send anyone over to Rome, that was in effect, he pointed out, an acknowledgment that nine-tenths of the attacks in its own columns upon the Ritualists were consciously mendacious. Moreover, in his issue for the first week in 1878 the Editor endorsed the proposal of a correspondent that the consecration of Archbishop Parker should be attacked with a view to driving over to Rome those Anglican Churchmen who believed the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Still, if the *Rock* had desired to justify itself, it had the plea of the most profound stupidity; for in one number it actually printed a letter (evidently a hoax) in which a great deal of varied learning was brought up—Sanscrit, Hebrew, Greek, Gaelic, and Hindoostanee—to prove that PET meant a *harlot*, and RUS *red*; and that thus the true meaning of TU ES PETRUS (Thou art Peter) was *Thou art a red harlot.*

Another hoax appeared later, and (we believe) not for the first time; the following being printed in a letter purporting to come from “A Despairing

Protestant :”—“ We all know how ridiculously palms are used in some churches on Palm Sunday. But surely when the Vicar of a Ritualistic church (as was actually done in my own parish) preaches with palms in his hands, and a crown on his head, Ritualistic priest-worship has attained its zenith. How long is this to be celebrated by truth-loving Englishmen ? ”*

And, indeed, the new paper carried a statement of its stupidity on its very forefront. The heading included an engraving which represented a Bible open at the words “ Their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges.”† Of course, if the promoters of the *Rock* had not been over head and ears in stupidity, they would have seen that the citing that text in such a connexion could only mean that the *Rock* newspaper was *their god*. It is a pity that they did not know their Bibles better ; else they might have remarked that text in Jeremiah which says, “ Is not My word like as a fire ? saith the LORD ; and like a hammer that breaketh the Rock in pieces ? ”‡

A portion of the paper was devoted for some time to what the Editor called “ Romish and Ritualistic gleanings.” This, however, had to be discontinued ; for it was found that the information thus brought into Low-Church families worked unsatisfactorily for Low-Church interests.

We must now, however, give some account of the second act (or rather, set of acts) of persecution in which the “ Church Association ” was engaged.

* *Rock*, March 22, 1883, p. 186.

† Deut. xxxii. 31.

‡ Jer. xxiii. 29.

One of the abuses which had grown up in the Church of England since the Reformation was that of proprietary chapels. Down to a very late period a new church could not be consecrated without a special Act of Parliament; and this, coupled in some cases with a dislike on the part of certain individuals for the ministrations done at their parish church, and in other cases, it may without much uncharitableness be surmised, a desire to make money out of the religion of the neighbourhood, occasioned the building of numerous proprietary chapels. And in 1882 or thereabouts almost the only places in London where Low-Church doctrines were taught were such chapels. Such was the chapel belonging to the Lock Hospital; such were Long Acre Chapel, Bentinck Chapel, Wheler Chapel, Welbeck Chapel, and St. John's, Bedford Row.

The chapel was ordinarily built to suit the requirements of those who wished to hear Mattins and Evensong read, and sermons preached, and to receive Holy Communion now and then, and nothing more. Hence it commonly formed a parallelogram, with the altar at one end, which might be either east, west, north, or south; a lofty erection was commonly put in front of the altar, and this erection was usually in three stages: one for the clerk, raised a step above the chapel-floor; one behind it for the reader (as the junior officiant was termed), at a still higher altitude; and the highest and hindermost of all for the preacher. Wags termed this triple stage a three-decker; it commanded not only the floor of the chapel, but one or more galleries, usually three, at the further

end and on either side; and in that at the further end was usually an organ, if that instrument, with a gallery for singers, did not occupy an exalted position behind the Holy Table, as in Quebec Chapel.

Underneath the chapel were in many cases wine-vaults. The chapel itself was let to a clergyman on lease; and that clergyman's object was then to draw a congregation by the fame of his preaching, and so, through the medium of pew-rents, to make the concern pay. Or it might belong to a body of trustees, or to a single individual, who appointed the clergyman on such terms as might be agreed upon. The clergyman then applied to the bishop of the diocese for a licence to officiate in the building; and, unless the incumbent of the parish objected, as was very rarely the case, the licence was not withheld, though the building still remained unconsecrated.

St. James's, Brighton, was one of these chapels: and, being one day for sale, was bought by the Rev. John Purchas. This clergyman had already distinguished himself in ecclesiastical literature by a work which he entitled *Directorium Anglicanum*, and in which he sought to show how far, in the multiplication of ornaments and ceremonies, a clergyman might go without violating the law of the Church of England. Having purchased the chapel, he commenced officiating in it; and before he had done so very long, he had carried out his views as to Anglican ritual, if not quite as far as he had indicated in the *Directorium*, yet, at all events, quite far enough to strike with horror any

Low-Churchman who might find himself unawares within St. James's Chapel.

We use this last expression of set purpose ; for nobody had any necessary business inside the chapel except Mr. Purchas himself and those whom he might have engaged to serve or assist him in the conduct of its services. The chapel was Mr. Purchas's own private property, and if he chose to lock up the doors from one year's end to another, or to turn it into a concert-room, or to pull it down and build a dwelling-house on its site, no one had any legal or moral grievance. And this consideration sets in its proper light the conduct of the "Church Association," the local branch whereof had for its chairman the Rev. Edmund Clay, Incumbent of St. Margaret's. Some information as to this gentleman's ministerial zeal and rubrical conformity may be gained by those who may care to read his evidence given before the Royal Commission on Ritual on the 4th of July, 1867. One of his churchwardens was a colonel in the army, Charles James Elphinstone, of No. 10 Montpellier Crescent ; and this gallant gentleman, acting on behalf of the "Church Association," got up an accusation against Mr. Purchas ; in consequence of which, when in the Court of Arches Dr. Tristram applied for the acceptance, by the Dean of Arches, of Letters of Request from the Diocesan Court, Sir Robert Phillimore assented. This was on the 15th of July, 1869. The charges against Mr. Purchas were thirty-three in number ; some of them of the most trivial character ; and every act of Mr. Purchas's whereof complaint was made

was divided as much as possible, so as to make the number of charges as large as possible. They were these:—

1. A procession round the chapel.
2. Use of a crucifix.
3. Having on the Holy Table a large metal crucifix.
4. Bowing to the crucifix.
5. Placing flowers on the Holy Table.
6. Having lighted candles on the Table.
7. Use of incense.
8. Rubbing a black powder on members of the congregation. (This was probably the putting ashes on their heads on Ash-Wednesday.)
9. Sprinkling holy-water on candles, the candles to be borne by members of the congregation.
10. Mixing water with wine for the Communion.
11. Administering the same to the communicants.
12. Elevating the elements.
13. "The same specified." (What this meant we do not know.)
14. Use of wafer-bread.
15. Using a bell at the time of consecration and elevation.
16. Introduction of "the Agnus" in the service when not authorised.
17. Elevating the offertory-alsms, and, after placing them for a moment on the Holy Table, handing them to an acolyte to be placed on the credence-table.
18. Suffering the Holy Table to be, on Good

Friday, without any decent covering. (That is, probably, without any covering at all.)

19. Allowing holy-water to be placed in the chapel.

20. Sprinkling holy-water on palm-branches.

21. Pausing at a certain part of the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church.

22. Giving notice on a certain Sunday, after the Sermon, that there would be on such a day a mortuary celebration for the repose of a Sister.

23. Using (we suppose, at Christmas) a model-figure of the infant Saviour, and on Whitsun Day a figure of a dove.

24. Giving notice of high celebrations of the Holy Eucharist.

25. Making the sign of the cross when about to mix the chalice.

26. Kissing the book from which the Gospel was read or to be read.

27. "Using a ceremony in admitting a new acolyte or choir-boy."

28. Wearing a cope.

29. Sanctioning the wearing of copes by other clergymen at Evening Service.

30. Using a chasuble in the Communion-Service.

31. Sanctioning the wearing of other vestments (probably tunics or dalmatics) by other clergymen.

32. Wearing a coloured stole.

33. "Suffering other clergymen to use vestments and to conduct the services not in a manner appointed by the laws ecclesiastical."

It is to be observed that Colonel Elphinstone

did not appear to have ever attended Mr. Purchas's chapel. The case was heard in the Court of Arches on the 19th of November, 1869. Mr. Purchas did not appear. The articles against him now numbered forty-four, and occupied sixteen folio pages of print. One of the articles had charged him with having "made a considerable, unnecessary, and unusual pause of about half a minute after pronouncing the words 'departed this life in Thy faith and fear.'" The Dean of Arches ordered this article to be struck out. Another had reference to the use of ornaments and vestments "such [said the accuser] as are in that behalf prescribed by the rubrics and general directions contained in a certain work, entitled *The Services of the Church, with Rubrical Directions according to the use of the illustrious Church of Sarum, together with the Hymns, Introits, Graduals, Tracts, and Sequences of the same Church.*" This also the Dean of Arches ordered to be struck out. Two other charges on important points of ritual were brought now for the first time against a Ritualistic clergyman; though (as we shall see) they formed part of the enemy's regular programme in subsequent prosecutions, where the case admitted: those charges being, the use of wafer-bread, and the use of the Eucharistic vestments. In the Mackonochie case the "Church Association" had not dared to prosecute the priest for wearing the Eucharistic vestments or for using wafer-bread, Dr. Archibald Stephens having advised them that in both these matters Mr. Mackonochie was sure to be pronounced within the law. And with regard to the Eucharistic vestments more

especially, the Judicial Committee of Privy Council had decided, in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*, that the Ornaments' Rubric (as it was called), taken in its plain and literal sense, was the law of the land; and one of the members of the Judicial Committee had said privately, with reference to this decision, as we remarked once before, "We have just given the clergy authority to wear the Eucharistic vestments if they like; it is to be hoped that they will not find it out." * Agreeably to which, the "Church Association" had said, in a circular put forth in the spring of 1867, "So long as the rubric in question remains in the Prayer-book, and the legal sanction above referred to continues to be law, every clergyman may claim the right to wear the vestments and use the other vessels or articles which were in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI." Now, however, there seemed some chance of getting these decisions contradicted, and the "Church Association" accordingly prosecuted Mr. Purchas for acting in conformity with them.

Judgment was given by Sir Robert Phillimore on the 3rd of February, 1870.

On many of the charges the court decided that Mr. Purchas had transgressed the laws ecclesiastical; and therefore directed a monition to be issued against him in respect of the practices to which those charges referred. But on the charges contained in five of the articles the court refused to issue a monition: thus declaring the legality of Mr. Purchas's practice in regard thereof. These

* See above, p. 103.

charges were, the use of the mixed chalice, the standing with back to the congregation while saying the Consecration-prayer, the use of wafer-bread, the use of the chasuble, and the use by assistant clergy of albs, dalmatics, and tunics. The charge of causing holy-water to be poured into divers receptacles in the chapel was another on which no monition was issued; the reason being that the fact had not been proved. Mr. Purchas was condemned in the costs of the proceedings.

Mr. Purchas had not appeared before the court, and he did not appeal against the judgment. But as the learned Dean of Arches had decided several usages to be legal which the "Church Association" did not like, it was determined by the Association to appeal to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council.

Before, however, the appeal could be heard, a little difficulty came in the way. Col. Elphinstone, the nominal promoter of the suit, was taken ill; and after expressing his regret at the concern he had had in the prosecution of Mr. Purchas, took his departure to that country where a wise man says that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom."* And it might have been thought, by those not behind the scenes, that the persecution of Mr. Purchas for doing what the Ecclesiastical Court had pronounced legal would now cease. It was not, however, so to be: the real prosecutor was the "Church Association:" and application was now made to the Privy Council that, Col. Elphinstone being deceased, the name of

* Ecclesiastes ix. 10.

another member of the Brighton "Church Association" Council—a Mr. Henry Hebbert—might be substituted for his, and the suit proceed. And it is to be observed that Mr. Hebbert's cause was equally disinterested with Col. Elphinstone's: for neither of those gentlemen had ever attended the chapel so as to be aggrieved at the proceedings whereof they complained. The Privy Council, however, assented to the prayer of the Association; and after the court had been duly packed by Lord Chancellor Hatherley, it sat to hear the appeal: the Committee being Lord Hatherley, the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), the Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson), and Lord Chelmsford; which last noble and learned lord was the same who, when plain Sir Frederic Thesiger, had given his opinion in peculiarly strong terms in favour of the legality of the Eucharistic vestments. Mr. Purchas, as before, did not appear. Judgment was given on the 23rd of February, 1871. Mr. Purchas was condemned on all points. He was condemned for mixing the chalice privately, in the sacristy, before service; on the ground that such a practice had not prevailed at all in the Christian Church: the fact being that the practice in question had been invariable in the East (except in the Armenian Church) for fourteen hundred years at least, and in the Church of England also, at Low Masses, according to the use of Sarum. He was condemned for consecrating with his back to the congregation, on the ground that in the rubric the words "standing before the Table" were to refer only to the time during which the celebrant was to

be ordering the bread and wine. He was condemned for the use of wafer-bread, on the ground that in the rubric the words "it shall suffice" imply that nothing else is to be allowed: and that common fine wheaten bread cannot be made in circular pieces. He was condemned for wearing the Eucharistic vestments, because, said their Lordships, "It was not seriously contended that albs and chasubles could, in any reasonable or practical sense, or according to any known usage, be worn, or be meant to be worn, concurrently with the surplice:" the fact being that this very combination is expressly prescribed, under certain circumstances, by the Roman Missal, and the old statutes of St. Paul's Cathedral. The only thing for which Mr. Purchas was not condemned was the wearing of a biretta: that not having been proved.

By this judgment the Privy Council contradicted judgments previously given by the same tribunal in the cases of *Westerton v. Liddell* and *Martin v. Mackonochie*. They gave such a force to the canons as would be repudiated by every other court of justice. A construction of the "Ornaments' Rubric" which had been held by every court and every legal authority, save only by Lord Cairns, Lord Justice Mellish, and Sir Roundell Palmer, they declared to be "a modern one." They relied on an argument from usage and desuetude when that argument was not only contrary to historical fact, but could, if sound, destroy their own conclusions; to say nothing of such an argument having been rejected by the same court in a

former case. They quoted authorities when in their favour, and abstained from even recording the same authorities when against them. Cases occurring in the period from 1560 to 1627 and 1636 were cited as explaining a rubric of 1662.*

* In this case there was an error committed in printing the judgment, to which the following letters refer:—

“Whitehall, Feb. 1, 1882.

“My Lord Archbishop,—I find on comparing the report of the judgment of the Privy Council on the appeal of ‘Hebbert v. Purchas’ in Moore’s ‘Privy Council Reports (New Series),’ vol. vii. p. 550, with the original draft of that judgment, which is in this office, that a typographical error occurs in the passage, stating that ‘the words of Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop Cosin in A.D. 1687, express the state of the law.’ The date of this opinion of Archdeacon Cosin should be 1627, and it is so stated in the draft of the judgment.—“I have the honour to be,

“Your Grace’s most obedient, humble servant,

“HENRY REEVE, Registrar P.C.

“The Lord Archbishop of York.”

The following was Dr. Littledale’s reply in the *Times*:—

“Sir,—There is one small detail in reference to the error in the Purchas Judgment of the year 1687 instead of 1627 as the date of Cosin’s Visitation Articles, which the Archbishop of York has omitted to mention in his letter in the *Times* of to-day. The Articles in question are cited in the judgment as settling the legal interpretation of the words ‘standing before the table’ in the rubric of the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office, and as proving that they do not mean standing in front, facing eastwards, because Cosin plainly implies that the north side was the legal position except during the Gospel and the administration of the Sacrament. But this rubric did not so much as exist in 1661—34 years later than Cosin’s Articles; and the rubric that he was glossing was that of 1552–1604—‘Then the Priest, standing up, shall say as followeth.’ Here there is no word of ‘before the table,’ and of course the officiant was bound to remain where a former rubric had put him. The Purchas Judges consequently used for their purpose a document which had absolutely no bearing whatever on the point at issue, which could not have so much as arisen until 34 years later than this piece of evidence. The date 1687, had it been the true one, would have been of the utmost value to their Lordships, as then they would have had a con-

And their Lordships were not ashamed to interpolate the word "only" after the word "surplice," both in citing the Advertisements of 1564, and in citing the Canons of 1603, with a view to bolstering up their lawless decision.

On the 1st of March the "Church Association" held its sixth annual meeting; and great was the joy expressed thereat upon the decision of the Privy Council. Mr. Purchas had been condemned, it mattered not how, or on what law.

In the course of the same spring Mr. Purchas had, most unexpectedly to himself, an offer of pecuniary assistance from a private source: in consequence of which he petitioned the Queen for a re-hearing of the case. His petition was referred to the Judicial Committee and brought on the 26th of April before the court; which now consisted of the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley), Lords Chelmsford, Westbury, and Cairns; Sir James Colville, Lords Justices James and Mellish; the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), and the Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson). After hearing the arguments, their Lordships decided that, considering the "grave public mischief that might arise from any doubt being thrown on the finality of the decisions of the Committee," "expediency required that the prayer of the petition should not be acceded to." Not unlike, if some very unparlia-

temporaneous exposition of the disputed rubric by the very man who framed it. And thus they got credit for having substituted it for one which is of no use to them. The moral position of their Lordships remains much the same, whichever view be accepted.

"RICHARD F. LITLEDALE.

"9 Red Lion-square, W.C., April 16."

mentary language is permissible, what we have heard designated as the school-boy's Ninth Commandment—"Tell a lie and stick to it."

The Judicial Committee had issued a monition to Mr. Purchas ordering him to desist from those practices which they had declared illegal. This monition Mr. Purchas disregarded: for which disregard information was duly laid against him before their Lordships, with the result of a fresh sentence, though not of a fresh trial. In this the Privy Council followed a precedent given by themselves some two years before. The principle was afterwards ruled by the Court of Queen's Bench to be an erroneous one: but that ruling came too late for any benefit to Mr. Purchas.

Mr. Purchas had been condemned in costs. The costs of the proceedings before the Court of Arches had been £1,387; and of the proceedings before the Judicial Committee, £2,510. Of these not a single farthing was ever received by the promoter of the suit,* Mr. Purchas's pecuniary means being apparently exhausted. Nor was it long possible even to dun him; for his health had given way under the worry of the prosecution, and he followed Col. Elphinstone out of the world. And St. James's Chapel came afterwards † to be numbered, with some triumph, at a "Church-Association" meeting, among those churches which the incumbents, in consequence of the action of the Association, had quitted.

* These particulars were stated by the Archbishop of York in the House of Lords, in the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, May 11, 1874.

† At the Autumn Conference in 1880.

CHAPTER LVIII.

Immoral Period, continued. Prosecutions of the Rev. Hooker Wix and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. Lord Shaftesbury's Ecclesiastical Courts Reform Bill. Opposition to communicating in the Palm. Low-Church Refusals to associate with Ritualists.

“How long shall they utter and speak hard things? and all the workers of iniquity boast themselves?”—PSALM xciv. 4 (Bible version).

ALONG with the persecution of Mr. Purchas there had begun the persecution of another priest, though this terminated sooner. In July 1869 the Low-Church Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Charles Richard Sumner) thought it necessary to attack Ritualism in his diocese. The Rev. Richard Hooker Edward Wix, Vicar of Swannore in the Isle of Wight, had given offence to a meddling Protestant by his manner of conducting Divine Service. The offended party, who lived a long way out of the parish, and proclaimed himself “a servant, not a paid servant, but still a servant, of the Church Association,”* appears to have complained to the Bishop; and although he was the only one who objected to Mr. Wix's ways, yet the Bishop took occasion thereby to order Mr. Wix's abstinence from the ceremonial use of lighted candles and incense, whether during Divine Service or subsidiary thereto. Believing that his usage in these respects was not touched by the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Mackonochie case, Mr. Wix refused. The Bishop thereupon forbade the

* *Church Times*, July 23, 1869.

two clergymen who had been assisting Mr. Wix without licence, viz. the Rev. R. Wilkins and the Rev. Henry Painter Goodridge, to officiate any more at Swanmore, and refused to license any clergyman in their place. Mr. Wix was ill, but the Bishop refused to reconsider his action. The two churchwardens wished to present his Lordship with a memorial in favour of Mr. Wix, signed by 480 parishioners and members of the congregation, but his Lordship would not receive it; and not only so, but took proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts. The case was heard on the 10th of November, 1869, before the Dean of Arches. A point of law arose as to whether the suit had not legally been terminated by the resignation of Bishop Sumner, which had taken place on the 28th of October. After, however, hearing arguments on either side of the question, the Dean of Arches gave permission to continue the case, only making an alteration in the title; and reserved the question of costs. Mr. Wix did not refuse to appear before the court; and when the court decided that he had acted illegally in the matter of lights and incense in the Eucharist, he declared his intention of submitting. We must now, however, come back to 1868.

It had been sometimes said by Low-Churchmen that their warfare against Ritualism was not because of certain vestments or other ornaments, but because of certain doctrines which the use of those vestments or ornaments signified. This was not altogether true; for the use of special vestments and other ornaments at the Eucharist

symbolised no more than the general truth that the Eucharistic service had a superior dignity to the services of Mattins and Evensong ; which truth no Low-Churchman, so far as we are aware, had ever dreamt of denying. And the Eucharistic vestments properly so called signified in themselves no more than our fellowship with the Lord in sufferings ; and the colours signified our fellowship with the Lord and with His saints in sorrow, joy, purity, or the grace of the Holy Ghost ; all which the Low-Churchman admitted, in theory at least, no less than his Ritualistic brother. And the cross spoke of atonement and reconciliation, or faith in the same ; and the two Eucharistic lights symbolised Christ the true Light of the world.

Nevertheless it was felt that some attempt ought to be made against Catholic doctrine as distinguished from Catholic ritual ; and in 1867 occasion was given for the prosecution of a noted Ritualist on account of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It will be remembered that this doctrine had been attacked by the Low-Church party about ten years before, when Archdeacon Denison had been prosecuted by Mr. Ditcher. In that case the Archbishop of Canterbury had pronounced the Archdeacon's doctrine inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England ; but the sentence had been quashed in the Court of Arches, on the ground that the prosecution had been undertaken too late. Low-Churchmen, therefore, had still room for attacking the Catholic doctrine a second time. We say the Catholic doctrine ; for that, beyond doubt, was what was

aimed at; although, as will be seen immediately, some of the expressions which formed the ground of the proceedings were not Catholic at all.

The occasion of the present attack was the publication of a volume of essays entitled *The Church and the World*; the essays treating of points then frequently under discussion between religious partisans in the Church of England. It was edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, who afterwards left the Church of England for the communion of Rome. Three series of essays appeared: one in 1866, another in 1867, and a third in 1878. The series for 1867 contained a paper by the Rev. William James Early Bennett, Vicar of Frome Selwood, Somersetshire: in which paper occurred the following passages:—

“The Priest or Priest and Deacon, formerly standing with faces opposite each other, and leaning over the Altar in apparently amicable conference, now appear in their sacerdotal position, as though they were in reality occupied in the great Sacrifice which it is their office to offer. Formerly an ordinary Surplice, and frequently not over-clean or seemly, covered the person of the ministering Priest, no difference being manifested between that and all other offering of prayer; now the ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here, before God’s Altar, is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious, than aught that man can speak of, namely, the Presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting. And towards this are tending all the ancient rites of the Church which are now in course of restoration. The solemn

music and the smoke of the incense go up before God, assuring the world that here there is no appearance only of love, but a reality and a depth which human hearts cannot fathom, nor even the angels themselves. The incense is the Mediation of Jesus ascending from the Altar to plead for the sins of man.”*

Mr. Bennett had also written *A Plea for Toleration in the Church of England, in a Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford*. In this (which was originally published in the year 1868) the author had spoken of “the real, actual, and visible Presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches,” † and had said, “Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their veil is the Sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” ‡

On account of these passages the Council of the “Church Association” decided, in March 1868, on commencing proceedings against Mr. Bennett for publishing unsound doctrine. In this the Association manifested either a profound ignorance of theology, or else a wicked malice against the individual whom they were attacking, if not both. For if their object had been to attack the Catholic doctrine pure and simple, that object could not be attained by attacking such expressions as those last cited; for these expressions would be rejected by any Catholic who was tolerably well instructed in Catholic

* *Church and the World*, pp. 12, 13.

† *Plea for Toleration*, 1st and 2nd editions, p. 3; 5th edition, p. 2.

‡ *Ib.* p. 14; 5th edition, p. 11.

theology; and the use of them by Mr. Bennett showed that gentleman to be no theologian at all, so far as the Eucharistic controversy was concerned. It is possible that the "Church Association" may have acted in simple ignorance; but it is also possible that they may have been actuated, as in their prosecution of Mr. Mackonochie, by malice against the individual, and have aimed merely at getting the expressions in question condemned for the purpose of ousting Mr. Bennett from his living, and gaining for themselves a power of pretending that the condemnation had been passed against the doctrine of the whole Catholic Church. But however all this may have been, the prosecution was determined on, and the person in whose name it was arranged to carry it on was T. Byard Sheppard, Esq., of Selwood Cottage, Frome—a parishioner of Mr. Bennett's.

The Church and the World, and likewise the *Plea for Toleration*, had been published in London; and therefore complaint was made to the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait) in the first place. That prelate, however, declined to move in the matter until compelled by law. Application was then made to the Court of Queen's Bench, which issued a writ of *mandamus* requiring the Bishop of London to examine the doctrine against which exception had been taken, and to determine whether or not to issue a commission of inquiry as to the *prima facie* grounds for further proceedings. The Bishop thereupon appointed a commission, which assembled on the 3rd of November, and unanimously decided that there was ground for further

proceedings ; and a report hereof was sent to the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord Auckland), in whose diocese Mr. Bennett's parish was situated.*

The case was brought before Sir Robert Phillimore, Dean of Arches, on Tuesday, the 5th of October, 1869 ; application being made for the admission of the articles containing the several charges of alleged heresy. The Dean of Arches said that he would appoint a sitting for the admission of the articles, and also name a day for hearing the arguments. On the 30th of October he directed the articles to be reformed, by omitting all such as charged the defendant with contravening the XXIXth Article of Religion, "Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper." From this ruling the "Church Association" appealed, with the Dean's permission, to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council ; which, on the 26th of March, 1870, affirmed Sir Robert Phillimore's judgment, and on the 8th of April formally remitted the case to him. Then the "Church Association" tried to get fresh letters from the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in order to warrant a charge against Mr. Bennett over and above what had been allowed. In this, however, they failed.

The case was argued on the 16th of June and two following days, 1870. Mr. Bennett did not appear either in person or by counsel. The charges against him were practically three :—Teaching (1) the Real Presence ; (2) the Eucharistic offering of the Lord's Body and Blood ; and (3) adoration of

* *Annual Report of the Church Association for 1868*, p. 50.

the Lord as present under the form of the consecrated elements. Judgment was pronounced on the 23rd of July. In anticipation of this, and in deference to Dr. Pusey, Mr. Bennett had withdrawn some of his unadvised language. He ceased to speak of the Lord's Presence on the altar as visible. Instead of professing to adore, and teach others to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them, he now said, "Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of bread and wine." Having respect to these matters, and to the great authorities which the judge cited, Sir Robert pronounced that Mr. Bennett had not thus transgressed the liberty allowed by the law. He made, however, no order as to costs. From this decision the "Church Association" appealed to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council; which tribunal, however, confirmed the judgment of the Court of Arches, to the unspeakable discomfiture of the Low-Church party. And no wonder; for it was now ruled by the supreme authority in the State that the following language (besides Mr. Bennett's other expressions as amended) was lawful in the Church of England:— "Since it was His true Body that was given for us on the cross, it is His true Body which was given to us in the Sacrament. The manner of the Presence is different; the Body which is given is the same." "It is a Presence without us, not within us only." "Our Eucharistic Office has become a living, real, spiritual offering of Christ upon the altar." The Archbishop of York (Dr.

Thomson) afterwards spoke of the judgment of the Privy Council in this case as having been a miscarriage of justice : on what grounds, however, his Grace did not, we believe, state. The Rev. R. W. Dibdin, Minister of West Street Chapel, St. Giles's, London, viewed the matter differently ; and, considering the Church of England to be committed, through the Privy Council judgment, to a doctrine which he did not believe, resigned, in 1871, his diocesan's licence, and chose to officiate thenceforward independently of the Anglican ecclesiastical organisation.*

Recurring now to the year 1869, we may note that the Earl of Shaftesbury in this year presented to the House of Lords a Bill for reform of the ecclesiastical courts. The Bill was supported by the council of the "Church Association," but lost. In the same year certain inhabitants of Liverpool memorialised the Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jacobson), of whose diocese Liverpool then formed a part, against the Rev. Charles Parnell, Perpetual Curate of St. Margaret's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, for having, in a paper of instructions put forth to his congregation, recommended them to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Body in the open palm. This custom, derived from primitive Christianity as it was in the time of St. Cyril of Jerusalem,†

* See a notice signed L. T. D. in the *Record*. I have not been able to verify the reference ; but it should be in some number for the end of July or beginning of August 1871.

† See the passage, Catech. [23] *Mystag.* 5, n. 18 [al. 21] (p. 331. c.), cited in Bingham (ed. 1855), vol. v. p. 443, *note*. It may be translated thus : " In approaching, therefore, come not with outstretched joints, or fingers disjoined, but making the left hand

had been revived in the Church of England by some High-Churchmen, and had on that account alone, as would seem, been resisted by Low-Churchmen; insomuch that on more than one occasion a Low-Church clergyman had refused the sacrament to persons who persisted in presenting the open palm rather than the fingers. And we are sorry to record of Bishop Jacobson, so estimable in many respects, that on this occasion he so far gave in to the impertinent memorialists as to call that method of communicating which had been recommended by Mr. Parnell, after the holy priest of Jerusalem, "degrading and disgusting."*

In this year two eminent Low-Church clergymen died—the Rev. Charles Bridges, and the Rev. Alexander R. C. Dallas. The former had been born March 24, 1794; and after passing the usual course of study at Queen's College, Cambridge, was ordained deacon in 1817, to the curacy of Gosfield, in Essex. He became Vicar of Old Newton in Suffolk in 1823, Rector of Melcombe Regis, Dorset, on the nomination of the Rev. Edward Holland, in 1849, and Rector of Hinton Martell in 1855, on the nomination of the Earl of Shaftesbury. He is best known by his Commentaries on Psalm CXIX., on the Book of Proverbs,†

to be a seat for the right, as being about to receive a King, and making your palm hollow, receive the Body of Christ, adding the *Amen*: and taking heed not to lose any of this same Thing unawares; since it is clear that whatsoever thou lovest, it is as though thou hadst been maimed in a limb of thine own."

* *Church Times*, November 5, 1869.

† We have had occasion to refer to this before, to show how little even Mr. Bridges knew of the nature of the Christian Dispensation. See above, p. 194, *note*.

and on Ecclesiastes, and by his work on the Christian Ministry. He died on the day after the foundation-stone of the now re-built parish church of Hinton Martell had been laid, *i.e.* on April 2.

Mr. Dallas had been ordained June 17, 1821, to the curacy of Radley in the Diocese of Salisbury; in the same year he left this curacy and took that of Highclere, Hants; leaving that for Wooburn in Buckinghamshire, which he held for about two years. He then became Curate of Burford, in Oxfordshire. In 1827 he was appointed to the vicarage of Yardley, and in 1828 to the rectory of Wonston, which he held till his decease, on the 12th of December, 1869. He had written many tracts, edited *The Pastor's Assistant* (most of which, we believe, was from his own pen), and been active in the cause of more than one Low-Church society.

Two or three other matters may be mentioned under the heading of the same year (1869). It will have been sufficiently evident, even from the early part of these ANNALS, that there had been two religions contending for mastery within the Church of England. This has often been denied by persons of no distinctive religion themselves; but it had been admitted by Low-Churchmen more than once,* and it received, about the time whereof we are speaking, two illustrations independent of one another. It had been desired by certain High-Church clergymen of the Diocese of London that there should be attempted this year in London

* "There are essentially two Churches in our Church, and they cannot exist together."—*Christian Observer* for 1845, p. 126.

"Two diametrically opposite codes of doctrine."—*Ib.* p. 172.

what was technically known in some foreign Catholic churches as a "Mission;" *i.e.* a special effort for the conversion of the careless and the ungodly, and the quickening of spiritual life in parishioners at large. A committee was formed to promote the plan, and the London clergy in general were invited to take part in carrying the plan into execution. Most of the Low-Church clergy, however, preferred working on their own lines, and would have nothing to do with the original committee. The other illustration was this: In view of the Church Congress to be held this year at Liverpool, Dean M'Neile was asked whether he wished to read a paper, or make a speech, on the subject of Cathedrals, at the said Congress. The "great and good" Dean asked, in reply, that his name might be altogether erased from the programme of the Congress, on the ground that he could not be a party to the recognition of Mr. Mackonochie as an acceptable fellow-labourer; Mr. Mackonochie having been (as he said) "condemned by the highest tribunal in the country."

It may also be mentioned that the *Christian Observer* had of late years been contending with difficulties. The proprietors professed to have received encouragement to continue the concern; but hinted that in continuing it the friends of Evangelical truth should rally to their support.*

* Preface to volume for 1869.

CHAPTER LIX.

Immoral Period, continued. Disestablishment of the Irish Church. Agitation against the Athanasian Creed. Consecration of St. Peter's, Clerkenwell. Bill for admitting Dissenters to Anglican Pulpits. Decease of the Rev. Henry Venn the younger. Biographical Notice of him. Opposition to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Decoration of St. Paul's. Erection of St. Mary's Hall, Cheltenham.

THE 1st of January in the year 1871 was an eventful day for the Protestant Church of Ireland. On that day, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament passed in 1869, the Church of Ireland became disestablished—that is to say, made independent of its sister the Church of England, plundered of its buildings and its revenues, and its prelates incapacitated from sitting in the House of Lords by virtue of their ecclesiastical office.

The only effect, however, worth mentioning, which this wicked and sacrilegious measure produced upon the Church of England was to bring over to England a certain number of Irish clergymen who, thinking to better their position in the world, left the Disestablished Church for her more fortunate sister, and so swelled the number of Low-Church clergymen on the eastern side of St. George's Channel. This was owing to the provisions of the Act. Under it, every person deriving any income from the Irish Church previously to its disestablishment was considered as a life-annuitant, the Government guaranteeing him the amount of such income annually until his death. He might, however, elect to *commute*; that

is, to draw his income, not from the Government, but from the Representative Church Body : and in this case the Government paid over to that body, out of the plunder seized, a capital sum, equivalent in value, according to the rules of life-annuity offices, to the amount which the commuting party had been receiving. The Representative Church Body was thenceforward answerable for paying the said party his income. The commuting party, having done this, might agree with the Representative Body to accept in lieu of such annual income a capital sum at once : this was called *compounding* ; and when it was done, the compounder's legal responsibilities to the Church in which he had been serving would cease. And some clergymen, having thus secured for themselves the position described by Bishop Wilberforce of Winchester to working-men at a Church Congress,* proceeded to increase their income by taking work in England ; while others, content with what they had got, sat down at their ease and took no more regular work at all. These were then said to have *commuted*, *compounded*, and *cut*.

About the year 1871 an agitation was got up against the use of the Athanasian Creed ; and it

* Bishop Wilberforce was addressing a meeting of working-men at the Southampton Church Congress in 1870—the first working-men's meeting which was ever held at a Church Congress—and he was speaking of himself as being a working-man. A voice came from the body of the meeting—"How about the pay, Sam?" "I will answer my friend there," said the Bishop. "I am extremely obliged to him for putting the question. *The pay goes on all the same, whether I work or am idle* ; and I should like to know how much work my friend there would do under similar circumstances."

appears to have been in reality part of an agitation against the use of all formulæ of belief: for Dr. Jowett, the Master of Balliol College, Oxford, and one of the writers of the notorious *Essays and Reviews*, suppressed even the Apostles' Creed on week-days in his college-chapel. The agitation was furthered by the declaration of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait) in the Upper House of his Convocation regarding the minatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, "We do not, there is not a soul in this room who does, nobody in the Church of England takes them in their plain and literal sense." In consequence hereof, the English Church Union got up a petition to Convocation for the retention of the symbol in question. Dr. Liddon, Canon of St. Paul's, got up another; and the clerical signatures to those were in the aggregate more than sixteen hundred. Archdeacon Denison got up a declaration in these terms:—"We, the undersigned priests and deacons, do solemnly declare that we do not recite the Athanasian Creed with private mental reservation, but accept and believe its words in their plain literal sense." To this the signatures were six hundred and seventy-two. We did not see more than one which we recognised as that of a Low-Churchman.*

In the same year was consecrated St. Peter's Church, Clerkenwell. This church had been erected with the contributions of those who wished to commemorate "the Smithfield martyrs," as

* Namely, that of the Rev. E. H. Perowne, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

those persons were designated who had suffered in Smithfield for their Protestantism, and was therefore called by them "the Martyrs' Memorial Church." The patronage was vested in trustees. The architecture and arrangements were of a character answerable to the object contemplated by the builders. The prayer-desk was made facing the congregation; the outside of the building was decorated with effigies of the principal Zuinglian heretics who had been executed according to the law of the land, and also with a sculptured representation of somebody being burnt alive. But neither within or without was "the sign of the Son of Man" to be anywhere seen; or if it was to be seen, we ourselves never succeeded in seeing it.

In this year, too, was introduced into the House of Commons, by Mr. Cowper-Temple and Mr. Thomas Hughes, a bill for enabling an incumbent, with the bishop's approval, to admit to his pulpit persons not in Anglican orders. Of this measure (which happily never became law) the *Christian Observer* expressed a general approval; only wishing that the Archbishop should be able to license a Dissenting preacher for the whole province, or the Crown for the whole kingdom!*

We must not omit to notice here the decease, on the 17th of January, 1873, of one who had succeeded his father, as the father had succeeded the grandfather, in being an eminent Low-Church leader. We speak of Henry Venn the younger, Secretary to the "Church Missionary Society," son

* *Christian Observer* for 1871, p. 792.

of John Venn, the Rector of Clapham, and grandson of Henry Venn the elder, author of the *Complete Duty of Man*.

Henry Venn the younger was born at Clapham on the 10th of February, 1796. His father, John Venn, died in June 1813, after constituting his son, "whose prudence and discretion" (said he) "will amply make up for his want of years and experience," one of his executors. Henry Venn began residence at Queen's College, Cambridge, in October 1814, under Dr. Isaac Milner, then President. He used to attend Mr. Simeon's church, and also the parties of undergraduates which used to meet at Mr. Simeon's rooms for conversational instruction on Friday evenings. He read steadily, gained a college prize for Latin declamation, and prizes also for classics and mathematics; and was elected scholar in his second year. In the Mathematical Tripos of 1818 he was nineteenth Wrangler, and a year later was elected Fellow. A few months afterwards he received deacon's orders at the hands of the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Sparke), doubtless on his college-title. While looking out for a curacy he did duty, as wanted, in London and the neighbourhood, and when not otherwise engaged used to attend for the most part St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, then served by Daniel Wilson, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta. His first curacy was that of St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, then mostly a sole charge, the Rector, Mr. Lloyd, being absent for half the year at another benefice which he had, and suffering at all times from bad health. Mr. Venn entered upon this curacy in January 1821,

and was ordained to the priesthood a few months afterwards. He held the curacy till near the end of 1824, when he returned to Cambridge with a view to regular and systematic professional study, and also with a view to taking his B.D. degree, that being required of him by the statutes of his college. In 1827 he accepted Mr. Wilberforce's presentation to the vicarage of Drypool, in Yorkshire, near the mouth of the Humber: went to reside there in 1828; and brought a wife there in the following year. Like other Low-Church incumbents of that day, he seems to have worked his parish with great diligence, as parish work was then understood. He organised various useful agencies, such as district-visiting, clothing-clubs, and missionary meetings in connection with the "Church Missionary Society." In his church the services appear to have been in the morning and afternoon of Sundays, with a catechetical lecture in the evening when a confirmation was in prospect, and perhaps (for aught that we have been able to learn) every Sunday. In preparing his candidates for confirmation he gave notice a month before the confirmation-day, lectured the candidates three times a week in the church, and saw each individual privately, sitting in church for this purpose five hours a day during the last six days.*

In October 1834 he left Drypool for the incumbency of St. John's, Holloway, to which he was presented by the trustees. The population of the district was then between three and four thousand. But Mr. Venn soon acquired an acquaintance with

* *Memoir*, p. 59.

his people personally. "An incident he once mentioned will serve to show how complete this acquaintance was. A man came hurriedly to him one day from a chemist's shop, saying that a dose of poison had just been obtained by some unknown person, whose suspicious manners made him now fear that a suicide was intended, and desiring to know whether anything could be suggested. Mr. Venn ran over in his mind a sort of mental list of his parishioners, and soon felt certain that, if the purchaser in question was one of them, he knew the only likely man. They went at once to the suspected house; his suspicions were confirmed, and the man was stopped before any mischief was done." *

In 1838 he was laid up with a dangerous disorder—dilatation of the heart and aorta; and had to cease from work to a great extent for nearly two years. In 1841 he became honorary secretary of the "Church Missionary Society," and in January 1846 he resigned his living, and was appointed the Society's paid secretary. This post he retained till within a short time of his decease, which took place, as we have said, in 1873.

Mr. Venn shared in the Zuinglian views commonly held by his party. He wrote to a friend in 1845: "I am reading Archbishop Cranmer on the Lord's Supper. It is close reading and I have little time. It has several allusions to the Baptismal Service, and seems to me to quite overturn your theory, as far as his authority goes. He compares the language of the two sacraments together. In

* *Memoir*, pp. 75, 76.

the Lord's Supper, This is my body, when it only represents it. In Baptism, This child is regenerate, when regeneration is only represented. I give what seems to me the substance of general passages: pray look at this. Cranmer seems to me to take the view in which I now rest, namely, that 'sacramental,' or 'federal,' language is essentially different in its construction and signification from plain prayer and thanksgiving, and must be construed upon different principles."* Mr. Venn's paper on the proper interpretation of the Baptismal Service of the Church of England is printed in an appendix to Mr. Knight's memoir of him. It was substantially "drawn up in the year 1850, when the 'Gorham' judgment of the Court of Arches was under the review of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in compliance with the request of one of the prelates who was an assessor in that review, and who was pleased to say that the paper contained a reasonable solution of the main difficulty of the case." This prelate, by the way, must have been either the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Sumner) or the Archbishop of York (Dr. Musgrave): most probably the former. In our own opinion, the paper is one of the finest specimens of sophistry which we have ever seen. After citing Cranmer's answers to Weston's interpretation of a passage in St. Chrysostom, the writer proceeds: "The answers of Cranmer, if drawn out in the form of an argument, assume that words which seem to bear a literal and absolute sense require a different interpretation when used in connection

* *Memoir*, pp. 265-6.

with a sacrament. The sacrament rules the interpretation of the language. Cranmer refers to this principle of interpretation as necessary to a right understanding of Baptism as well as of the Lord's Supper, and Cranmer had the chief hand in the construction of our Liturgical Services."* Mr. Venn then cites instances in which the present tense is used by Sacred Writers in a future signification, and proceeds, on the strength of that, to attribute a future signification to certain *past* tenses in the Anglican Baptismal Offices, and to deduce, further, the conclusion that "the true, natural, and proper interpretation of the Baptismal Service respecting the regeneration of an infant is not that regeneration is absolutely and always communicated in baptism."† In other words, that the future interpretation of the aforesaid past tenses may turn out false, after all: for what he calls the Sacramental interpretation is "consistent with the Charitable, Hypothetical, or Conditional mode of interpreting the Baptismal Service."‡ He does not, however, explain how the words "sacramental" and "federal" come to be (as he uses them) synonymous; nor why plain language in one document is to be construed in a different way to the same language in another.

Mr. Venn was a man of remarkable good sense and business habits. But his biographer records this wonderful piece of nonsense in a letter to the Rev. J. Venn, Hereford:—"I fought hard to get in a few words that our chief objection to light

* *Memoir*, p. 481.

† *Ib.* p. 488.

‡ *Ib.* p. 489.

and incense was their countenance of Romish vows renounced at the Reformation.”* Such an effect has Protestantism on the intellect! He disapproved of church restoration generally, calling it “the mischievous fashion.”† As a member of the Ritual Commission, he worked hard to get the Prayer-book altered in a Protestant direction. He wished the rubric about vestments so altered as to enforce the custom generally prevailing before the Catholic revival. He advocated the non-exemption of proprietary chapels from the restrictions to be proposed by the Commissioners. He wished the permission still to be in force of placing the altar in the body of the church: the rubric which bears on the subject being, in his judgment, a protest against bringing back the Mass. He wished the eastward position forbidden to the celebrant; because “as soon as he turned the north-west corner he was slipping into the position of a sacrificing priest at a Romish Mass.”‡ His later views of Ritualism, however, were thus expressed:—“With all these errors and superstition, there is a marked work of the Spirit going on in this country. A.B., with all the nonsensical practices observed in his church, preaches the Gospel, and souls are converted. Fifty years ago his sermons would have been called Methodistical.”§ Though even then he showed how little he understood the High-Church party, when he could write about “the silly dishonour done to His [Christ’s] office by those who” (said he) “obscure it by sacerdotal-

* *Memoir*, p. 271. Mr. Knight gives no preceding context.

† *Ib.* p. 202.

‡ *Ib.* p. 501.

§ *Ib.* p. 284.

ism.”* That was about the year 1869. Even as he had said in his sermon at the consecration of Dr. Pelham to the See of Norwich, that superstition substitutes sacramental grace for the truth of the Atonement made by Christ.† The year 1873 showed how far some Low-Churchmen considered promises to be binding which had been made to High-Churchmen. One of the numerous High-Church societies was the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. The objects of this Confraternity were two: the honour due to the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood, and mutual and special intercession at the time of and in union with the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The rules were, to communicate, or at least to be present at celebration, on Sundays and the greater festivals, and other holy-days, unless prevented by sickness or other urgent excuse: to promote, by all legitimate means, frequent and reverent celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, as the chief act of Divine Service; and to make such special intercessions as should be from time to time directed. To this last rule exception might be taken by a Churchman of any party; for the placing oneself under it involved the giving up of one’s own responsibility in the matter of private prayer. It does not appear, however, that this formed the only ground of exception on the part of Low-Churchmen against the Confraternity: their dislike of the Confraternity arose, it is probable, from the doctrine which the members professed to hold,

* *Memoir*, p. 356.

† Cited *ib.* p. 140.

and on which they proposed to act; that doctrine being the same which both the Court of Arches and the Privy Council had declared lawful, but which Low-Churchmen denied and hated. Now, in the town of Gateshead, in the Diocese of Durham, there had been constituted a mission-district, which had been placed under the charge of the Rev. John Wilkinson. A church was in process of erection, towards which the Low-Church Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring) had promised a contribution of fifty pounds. Being, however, informed that Mr. Wilkinson was a member of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, his Lordship deemed that fact a sufficient justification for departing from his word; and the promised contribution was refused. It was made up by the proprietor of the *Church Times*.

It may also be noted, with reference to the work of decorating St. Paul's Cathedral internally, in a manner agreeable to the architecture, how the *Christian Observer* regarded that good work. "Strenuous efforts" (said the Editor) "are being made to convert St. Paul's Cathedral into a huge Jesuit church, with all the oppressive and vulgar gorgeousness characteristic of that false taste which is the concomitant of false doctrine."*

In the following year (1874) was erected the building known as St. Mary's Hall, St. George's Place, Cheltenham. It formed the premises of that college for training Low-Church school-mistresses the establishment of which we have already noted under the year 1847. Like St.

* *Christian Observer* for 1873, p. 560.

Paul's College, the home of the sister-institution for training Low-Church schoolmasters, the building did not include a chapel, though intended to accommodate sixty resident students: it was deemed sufficient that the students should attend prayers in the large lecture-hall, but the authorised services of the Church only on Sundays at the Church of St. Matthew.*

CHAPTER LX.

Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. John Edwards. Public Worship Regulation Act. Lord Penzance. Commencement of Mr. Edwards's Prosecution. New Suit against Mr. Mackonochie.

“Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with Thee, which frameth mischief by a law?”—PSALM xciv. 20 (Bible version).

THE year 1874 witnessed another wicked suit against a faithful Anglican priest. The living of Cheltenham had been purchased by Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, and vested in trustees appointed by him, and of his way of thinking, and the place had thus come to be a stronghold of the Low-Church party. And (as was to have been expected) a branch of the “Church Association” had been formed there, and numbered a good many members. These began to look about them for some practical way of showing their hatred of Catholic ways; and they had not to look very far off, for at a distance of some two or three miles from Cheltenham they found not

* See above, p. 12.

only a Ritualistic priest and congregation, but a Ritualistic parish, to wit, the parish of Prestbury. Of this parish the Rev. John Edwards (afterwards Baghot de la Bere) had become vicar, October 25, 1860. The living was a family one; Mr. Edwards's family was known in the place, and he entered upon his pastoral charge with a certain amount of prejudice, on the part of the parishioners, in his favour.

Mr. Edwards's University life is thus described by the Rev. James Ridgway, Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in a letter to the *Guardian* of February 9, 1881:—

“I have known John Edwards, of Prestbury (Baghot de la Bere), for thirty years, and as he had now been judicially pronounced by one who claims to be the highest ecclesiastical judge in this realm (acting for and in the name of the spiritual head of the English Church) unfit to exercise his clerical functions in this Church of England, I venture to ask a small space in your columns to do him an act of bare justice.

“I first became acquainted with John Edwards when he and I were undergraduates together, at Oxford, on his joining a small band associated together to strengthen one another in the cultivation of habits of devotion, the study of God's Word, obedience to authorities as over them, pursuit of mental training, frugality, and purity of life. They drew up ‘rules of life’ as their guide, which were mainly these—to rise an hour before chapel for prayer, to read the Bible devotionally for a prescribed time each day, to attend chapel twice a day and Holy Communion weekly (if provided), to

guard the tongue and the eye from sin, to abstain from all places of dissipation, to keep their body [*sic*] in temperance, soberness, and chastity, to speak evil of no man, to use their utmost endeavours to make the best use of the University for the training of their minds as the duty of their state of pupillage, to practise fasting and self-denial in meat, drink, and dress, so as to devote at least one-tenth of their income to charity.

“ For thirty years he has had this ‘rule of life’ stedfastly before him. I have known him intimately the whole time. . . .

“ At Oxford he was entirely free from any fanaticism, conspicuous for calm solidity of character, steadily pursuing his vocation in simplicity, perseverance, holiness, humility. A man who thus passes safely through the dangerous ordeal of an undergraduate’s career, when passions are strong and temptations are very great, seldom alters much in after life : he has been no exception. When I became curate there, he was one who tendered me voluntary help in a very poor parish, by reading to the sick, teaching in our night schools, and singing in our choir. His parting gift to me when he left Oxford was a book of devotions for the clergy. A few months later, I met him accidentally in the Strand, when he amazed me with the intelligence that he had obtained a commission in the army, and was about to sail for India : but he never went. I never asked him the reason. . . . It could not have been the hope of succeeding to the vicarage of Prestbury ; for his father, who held it, was in the prime of life, and is living still. A few months

later, he was curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and in eight years, on the resignation of his father, became Vicar of Prestbury."

Mr. Edwards's conduct subsequent to his entry into the vicarage showed that the prejudice of the parishioners in his favour was not a mistaken one. Active as a parish priest, and possessing a true pastor's heart, he led his people on from one improvement to another, till the parish became one of the best examples, probably, of what an English parish should be. The church was restored and beautified. The Eucharist was celebrated daily, the services were offered with heartiness and reverence, and attended devoutly. At Christmas 1860 there were only thirty-nine communicants, but at Easter 1869, the first celebration after the church had been fully restored, and advanced ritual had been introduced, there were two hundred and fifteen.

We believe it to be perfectly true, that when Mr. Edwards had come into residence as vicar, being known to be a High-Churchman, not one of the Cheltenham clergy did him the civility of a call. The antagonism to him, however, on the part of his Low-Church neighbours, was not merely negative. On Good Friday, the 11th of April, 1873, a tailor named Charles Combe, and another person, who appears to have been the Baron de Ferrières, a member of the "Church Association,"* prepared for the Easter Festival by signing what they term a presentment against Mr. Edwards. This document was sent to the Bishop of Gloucester and

* *Church Times*, Feb. 24, 1882.

Bristol (Dr. Ellicott), promptly acknowledged by him,* and acted upon as the basis of subsequent proceedings.

The antecedents of Mr. Edwards's nominal prosecutors were not altogether such as to give them any moral right to act as they did. Combe was stated to be a Nonconformist.† Certainly he never had been a communicant at Prestbury, even before the restoration of the church, or the introduction of full Catholic ritual. But when, at the Bishop's next visitation, a regular legal presentment was made by the churchwardens, it was quietly set aside; the reason being, apparently, as Mr. Edwards inferred, that it did not subserve the purposes of persecution, while the earlier document did.

The charges against Mr. Edwards were thirteen in number. They included the having the metal crucifix on the re-table, with candles by the side thereof, which candles were lighted at certain parts of the service; and the bowing to or towards the crucifix in a ceremonial manner; and likewise the wearing the Eucharistic vestments. Mr. Edwards's case appears to have come before the Court of Arches on the 23rd of January, 1875, when the Court was moved to expunge certain passages in the responsive plea filed by Mr. Edwards, and which were to the following effect: that Mr. Combe was promoting the suit [against the wish and desire of the parishioners generally; and that in fact

* *St. Mary's, Prestbury. The Prosecution. A Letter to the (late) Archbishop of Canterbury, by John Baghot de la Bere, Vicar*, pp. 26, 27.

† Leading article in *Church Times*, Nov. 4, 1881.

238 communicants, of whom 197 were parishioners, had expressed to the defendant and to the Bishop their dislike of the suit and the disturbance which it was causing in the parish ; that Mr. Combe had, both at the time when the suit was instituted, and also at the time then present, a pew in an Independent meeting-house at which he constantly attended, paying rent for the said pew ; and that he was promoting the suit at the instigation and cost of the Baron de Ferrières and other persons residing in Cheltenham, and who were not parishioners of Mr. Edwards. The Dean of Arches assented.

The chief event, however, of the year 1874 was the passing, in the interests of the Low-Church party and of irreligion in general, of the Public Worship Regulation Act ; perhaps the very greatest wrong which the Church of England had ever suffered since the manifold wrongs of the Great Rebellion. We have seen that in 1868 two bills bearing upon the conduct of Anglican worship had been brought into Parliament, and another bill in 1869 for reforming the ecclesiastical courts. The bill of which we are now to speak was to combine the alleged objects of all the three former ones. The origin of it is involved in some obscurity. The whisper went about, and was never, so far as we are aware, contradicted, that the Archbishop of Canterbury received an intimation from a certain high quarter that he was expected to take some step or introduce some measure for putting down Ritualism, towards which certain members of the Royal Family were thought to be inclined. And

certainly there was some ground of objection against the courses of procedure in the ecclesiastical courts, independent of party considerations or theological bias. In particular, the "Church Association" had found the proceedings, both in the case of Mr. Mackonochie and in that of Mr. Purchas, to be both tedious and costly; and they wanted a new Act which should enable them to work for putting down Ritualism with a greater probability of success than was possible at present. They wanted a new provision for prosecutions—that proceedings might be taken against a Ritualist by almost anyone, irrespective of moral right. They wanted a new provision for judgments: not learned judgments, proceeding upon extensive and accurate knowledge of Church law and custom, and which might give the defendant the benefit of any doubt in the judge's mind, but such judgments as might lend the cloak of authority to cover any amount of ignorance or iniquitous partiality. It mattered not how the Church was wronged, it mattered not how the Constitution in Church and State and the provisions of Magna Charta were violated; the practical assertion of parliamentary omnipotence in the interests of the Low-Church party—this was what Low-Church people wanted.

And this, by God's all-wise permission, Low-Church people got. On the 20th of April, 1874, the Archbishop of Canterbury introduced into the House of Lords, with the express concurrence of all the bishops save two, a Bill for the Regulation of Public Worship, allowing any three parishioners who chose to declare themselves members of the

Church of England to prosecute their parish priest for any alleged breaches of the ritual law. And it is to be observed that no test of Church-membership was prescribed, or any penalty provided for making a declaration falsely. The bill had been drafted, under the Archbishop's direction, by Chancellor Brunel. In introducing it the Primate declared his belief that the people of England beheld in Ritualism a disposition to return towards the Romish ceremonial, and that unless the rulers of the Church came forward to restrain it the people would consider that the *raison d'être* of the union between Church and State had disappeared. A clause for abolishing the old episcopal courts and creating a new court with a new parliamentary jurisdiction was moved by the Earl of Shaftesbury in Committee; both the Archbishops resisted this, but it was carried against them. Then the Earl of Shaftesbury moved that the judge of the new court should have a stipend of three thousand pounds, payable out of the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Against this combined injury and insult the Archbishop of York protested; and then followed a scene, with mutual contradiction by the Archbishop and the Earl. In a discussion as to the manner in which the new judge should deal with cases, the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness) prophesied what he called a strike among the bishops, and then followed another scene. At last, however, the bill passed the Upper House, the whole bench of bishops voting for it except Dr. Moberly of Salisbury, who voted against it, and two or three who absented themselves on the

occasion; so little account did the right reverend fathers make of their spiritual jurisdiction in matters of discipline.

After passing the Lords, the bill was brought into the House of Commons by the Right Hon. Russell Gurney, Conservative member for Southampton. Mr. Disraeli was then Prime Minister. He did not at first know what the object of the bill was, and asked the Archbishop of Canterbury in a casual way, "What is it for? what is it introduced to do?" The Archbishop replied, "To put down the Ritualists." * On the morning of the day (July 15) fixed for the second reading, the Archbishop received a note from Mr. Disraeli to the effect that the Government could not let the bill go on. Forthwith his Grace went to Sir William Vernon Harcourt, then Solicitor-General, and the result of the interview was that the second reading was carried, with the help of a great many Conservative members. † That was the occasion on which the Premier, anticipating an accession of popularity as the result of the line which he took, stated plainly in the House that the bill had for its object the putting down of Ritualism, and made his famous sneer at what he chose to call the Mass in masquerade; the meaning of which phrase, however, was not so obvious as the *animus* of it, though the phrase was eagerly caught up and repeated by Low-Churchmen.

Some alterations were proposed in the Commons

* Letter of "A South London Parson" in the *Morning Post*, Nov. 10, 1881.

† Archdeacon Denison, *Notes of my Life*, p. 57.

which were not accepted. Thus Mr. Raikes, Conservative member for Chester, advocated the non-exemption of private chapels from the provisions of the bill; and Mr. Lowe, Liberal member for the University of London, thought that the bill should be so extended as to admit of prosecutions for false doctrine. But at last, with the support of the hon. members mentioned above, although opposed by Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gathorne Hardy (since Lord Cranbrook), Lord John Manners, Lord Henry Lennox, Earl Percy, Lord Yarmouth, Mr. J. G. Talbot, and the Irish Lord Chancellor Ball, it passed the House, and came into operation on the 1st of July, 1875. By it the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were empowered to appoint one permanent judge in lieu of the two judges presiding in their several provincial courts. An archdeacon, a churchwarden, or three parishioners, being members of the Church of England, might make a representation to the bishop of the diocese respecting any ornaments or furniture of a church, or of the minister, which might be deemed illegal, or any neglect to use a prescribed ornament or vesture, or any unlawful alterations, omissions, or additions in regard to rites and ceremonies. Then, if the bishop, "after considering the whole circumstances of the case"—so ran the Act—thought that proceedings ought not to be taken on their representation, he had to record in the diocesan registry his reasons in writing; otherwise, he was to transmit a copy of the representation to the clergyman against whom the complaint was made. If then the parties consented that the bishop should adjudicate,

the bishop was empowered to adjudicate accordingly; if they did not consent, the case was to be sent to the new parliamentary judge, from whose decision there was to be an appeal to the Queen in Council. And obedience to the order of the bishop or of the judge might be enforced by inhibiting the clergyman from exercising cure of souls for three months. This wicked, unconstitutional Act the *Christian Observer* expected to be productive of benefit.*

As if to embitter the Church's cup by as much insult as possible, the first judge appointed under the Act was James Plaisted, Baron Penzance, who from 1863 to 1872 had been judge of the Court of Probate and Divorce, and had, it was said, expressed spontaneously his willingness to undertake the new parliamentary office. In the old Provincial Court of Arches, which Lord Penzance's court was now supplanting, the presiding judge had not been wont to enter on his office until certified by the Archbishop of Canterbury as sufficient on the grounds of piety, learning, and sound morals. This was not deemed necessary for the judge of the new parliamentary court. Nor did the noble lord qualify himself by subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles, or taking the oath of allegiance to the Queen, or any oath to deal fairly between suitors.

We may now come back to Mr. Edwards of Prestbury. In this year (1874) Charles Combe instituted proceedings against him, under the Church Discipline Act, for Ritualistic rites and

* *Christian Observer* for 1874, p. 719.

ceremonies in the celebration of the Eucharist. The case was sent up by the Bishop in Letters of Request, and came before Lord Penzance shortly after his appointment under the Public Worship Regulation Act, as we shall see hereafter.

Mr. Mackonochie, however, was not to be left alone. In June this year Mr. Martin instituted a new suit against him, under the Church Discipline Act, complaining of several alleged breaches of the law by him. This new suit was avowedly undertaken for the sole purpose of enabling the prosecutors to have the services of a particular counsel, two other suits, in which nearly the same points were raised as in this, being already before the courts. "A most reasonable application—namely, to postpone the hearing of this suit till the expected decision of the Privy Council in a similar case, *Roughton v. Parnell*—was refused. The articles . . . comprised (putting on one side the technicalities) the use of lighted candles during Morning Prayer; undue elevation of the paten and cup; processions with banners, crucifix, and candles; singing *Agnus Dei* after the consecration; making the sign of the cross; kissing the Prayer-book; the use of wafer-bread; the wearing of vestments; and standing in the eastward position."* The case was heard before Sir Robert Phillimore, Dean of Arches; Mr. Mackonochie appearing before the court, but protesting against the spiritual validity of any decisions or judgments which might be founded on the authority of any

* *The Church in Baldwin's Gardens*, p. 69.

rulings of the Queen in Council, or any purely secular authority. Sir Robert Phillimore would not allow this protest to be filed. The case was then heard; and on the 1st of December Sir Robert pronounced judgment. He acknowledged the competence of his court for allowing the question already decided by the Privy Council in the Purchas case to be re-argued; especially as the judgment therein given was irreconcilable, as regarded the ornaments of the minister, with the former judgment of the same tribunal in the case of Liddell *v.* Westerton, and as regarded the position of the minister, irreconcilable with the judgment given in the case of Martin *v.* Mackonochie. And with regard to the use of wafer-bread, he thought it possible that if their Lordships had had the opinions of counsel before them they would have arrived at a different conclusion from that at which they did arrive. But notwithstanding these considerations, holding the point of elevation to be not proved against the defendant, but all the other points proved, he suspended Mr. Mackonochie *ab officio* for six weeks.

From this judgment, pronounced on the 7th of December, 1874, but never served till 26th of July, 1875, Mr. Mackonochie appealed to the Queen in Council, supposing that his appeal would be heard by the New Court of Judicature. Afterwards, however, apprehending that this was a mistake, and that it would be heard before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, from which he expected neither consideration nor impartiality, he withdrew his appeal, and submitted to the sentence

of the Dean of Arches. His costs, taxed at £460 4s. 4d., were duly received by the prosecuting Association.*

CHAPTER LXI.

Immoral Period, continued. Memorial against the Rev. C. E. Hodson. *Christian Observer*. Memorial against Vestments and Eucharist Position. Case of the Rev. Flavel Cook. Public Worship Regulation Act. Line taken by Low-Churchmen. Prosecution of the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale. Results.

Sing a song of humbug,
 A wagon-load of jaw,
 Church-Associationists
 Clamouring for "law :"
 When "the Law" was laid down,
 They went on all the same,
 Just as they had done before,
 Without a bit of shame.

A New Reading of an Old Rhyme.

THE year 1875 was signalised by the departure of the Arctic Expedition for the discovery, if possible, of the North Pole. The expedition sailed from Portsmouth on the 29th of May, and consisted of the "Alert," Captain Nares, and the "Discovery," Captain H. F. Stephenson. It had been originally intended that no chaplain should accompany the expedition, on the ground, according to Mr. Ward Hunt, that a chaplain would take up too much room. Strong representations, however, were made to the Government that the officers and crews ought not to be two years without the holy offices; and in consequence hereof it was finally

* This was acknowledged in the report presented at the Annual Meeting held on February 25, 1876.

decided that two chaplains should be sent; and two clergymen, having volunteered for the service, were accepted. The two clergymen were the Rev. Henry William Pullen and the Rev. Charles Edward Hodson. The former had been an assistant-master in St. Andrew's College, Bradfield, near Reading, Vicar-choral of York Minster, and Vicar-choral of Salisbury Cathedral. He was known to be the author of *The Fight at Dame Europa's School*, and was now appointed chaplain on board the "Alert." Mr. Hodson had been Curate of St. James's, Devonport, and afterwards chaplain in the Navy; he was now appointed to the "Discovery." Neither of these clergymen was a Low-Churchman; it does not, indeed, appear that any Low-Churchman had volunteered for either post. Some Low-Churchmen, however, got up a memorial to the Government against Mr. Hodson, on the ground that he was a member of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. It need hardly be added that the memorial failed of success.

In this year the proprietors of the *Christian Observer* found it necessary to amalgamate that periodical with another, and the united magazine was henceforth known as the *Christian Observer and Advocate*.

We have seen that neither in the Mackonochie case nor in the Purchas case had the eastward position of the celebrant when consecrating the Eucharistic elements been pronounced illegal; but that in the Purchas case the Eucharistic vestments had been condemned as illegal. The "Church Association," however, had a misgiving that the

Eucharistic vestments, no less than the eastward position, might yet be declared permissible, if not obligatory; and hence they deemed it advisable to get up a memorial to the Queen against both. And such a memorial was got up accordingly, and presented to her Majesty on the 30th of June, 1875, after receiving the signatures of 140,480 persons calling themselves members of the Church of England.

The Low-Church party, however, were not entirely on the wrong-doing side. About this time a stand was made, though, unhappily (as some thought), only a temporary one, by a Low-Church clergyman, on behalf of what little ecclesiastical discipline still survived in the Church of England. A barrister, Mr. Henry Jenkins, had put forth a publication, apparently for family use: * it was entitled *Selections from the Old and New Testaments*, and in it he had omitted such passages as seemed to imply the endlessness of future punishment, and the existence of the personal evil spirit called in Scripture the Devil, and had arranged such a selection of readings from Holy Scripture as seemed to impugn the character of the passages omitted therefrom, as "quite incompatible with religion or decency;" this being expressly stated in a letter written by Mr. Jenkins. Considering that Mr. Jenkins had thus become what the Prayer-book terms a slanderer of God's Word, his parish priest, the Rev. Flavel James Cook, Vicar

* We say "apparently," for the book had no preface of any kind to indicate the system on which the *Selections* had been made.

of Christ Church, Clifton, refused him the Holy Communion. Appeal was then made to the Bishop (Dr. Ellicott), who thereupon issued a commission to investigate Mr. Jenkins's complaint; and the Commissioners reported that there was, in their opinion, *prima facie* ground for further proceedings. On the 23rd of January, 1875, Dr. Tristram prayed the Court of Arches to accept Letters of Request from the Bishop authorising criminal proceedings against Mr. Cook; and Sir Robert Phillimore assented. The case having been duly argued, the Dean of Arches pronounced judgment to the effect that Mr. Cook had been fully justified in repelling Mr. Jenkins from Communion. Mr. Jenkins thereupon appealed to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council; which body, after hearing the case, delivered judgment on the 16th of February, 1876. According to this determination, the omission from Mr. Jenkins's work of certain Scripture passages, on the specific ground stated in the appellant's letter, that those passages were quite incompatible with religion and decency, supplied no sufficient ground for concluding that the appellant rejected the doctrines implied thereby. And in consequence the court reversed the decision of the Dean of Arches, and condemned Mr. Cook in costs.

The *Rock* newspaper, whilst repudiating Mr. Jenkins's theology, deemed that a different judgment from that which the Judicial Committee had given "would have struck an infinitely more serious blow against the truth."

Mr. Cook did not see his way to making fight, and therefore immediately resigned his benefice.

On the 1st of July in this year (1875) there came into operation the Public Worship Regulation Act; the slight sketch of which given above will have sufficed to show how alien the spirit of it was from the spirit of English criminal law in general. For not only did it give the Bishop a veto on any criminal proceedings which might have been commenced under it, but by allowing appeals to the Privy Council it both denied to a defendant that benefit of doubt which is always given to a person charged with a civil crime, such as murder or burglary, and also permitted him to be tried more than once for the same alleged offence. It does not, however, appear to have received at the hands of Anglican Churchmen generally that consideration which was fitting while before Parliament. The Ritualistic party was still in a minority; and their enemies were well content with an Act which the Prime Minister himself, in supporting it through the House of Commons, had declared to have for its object the putting down of Ritualism. Indeed, that statement of Mr. Disraeli's was sometimes alleged by Low-Churchmen as a reason why the Act ought not to be interpreted to the disadvantage of Low-Churchmen for violating rubrics in ways common among them.*

Such, however, as it was, it had now become available for use; nor were the Low-Church party slow to put it in operation. And as that part of our ANNALS on which we have now entered will consist almost entirely of the narrative of suc-

* So, at least, it was alleged to the writer by a Low-Church clergyman.

cessive prosecutions for alleged breaches of the Church's ritual law, it may not be amiss to make a few remarks here upon the character of the Low-Church party as indicated by the line thus taken by their most active members with the tacit consent of the rest.

To many persons the conduct of the Low-Church party towards their Ritualistic adversaries may seem strange and inexplicable. Why should persons professing zeal for spiritual religion seek to regulate the outward forms of religion by Acts of Parliament and courts of law? Their Puritan predecessors had desired freedom from rubrics; or at least as much freedom from rubrics as was possible: why should Puritan religionists seek to promote their spiritual religion by enforcing rubrics as interpreted by hard-headed lawyers, and by enforcing them too with heavy costs, suspension, deprivation, and imprisonment?

Inconsistency, indeed, is, alas, no uncommon characteristic of fallen human nature; but in the case of the Low-Church party the inconsistency in the matter now under consideration was little, if at all, beyond appearance. Their proceedings were not taken for the purpose of regulating any outward forms of religion, so far as they themselves were concerned. The religion with which they sought to deal was not one that was common to themselves and their adversaries, and the rules whereof they were seeking to get enforced on all alike: it was a religion entirely distinct from theirs, and essentially antagonistic. To the devout Anglo-Catholic the outward ceremonies which he used

were a part of his religion; they were some of those "works" by which his "faith was made perfect;"* and that was why he made so much of them. The Low-Churchman, on the contrary, had his religion within himself, and not essentially involving anything outward at all. To him the visible Church was not by any means a necessary thing; nay, so far from being necessary, it was rather a hindrance than otherwise, when considered in connexion with authority. To him the Church was a merely human institution, in which certain spiritual commodities could be had—and to which it was generally more advantageous to go for those commodities than to any other institution—but that was all. The Church's times of worship might be adopted in so far as they happened to square with Low-Church convenience; some of her prayers might be uttered in the course of, or expressions from them worked up into, Low-Church devotions; but the Church's times, generally speaking, were ignored by the Low-Church party in general,—the Church's prayers were made to give place, wherever this was practicable, to Puritan forms, written or extempore,—and in the preparation of these forms, the Church's method of Psalms, short prayers, and numerous responses, was almost entirely rejected. Such parts of the Prayer-book as were customarily in use were used at such times as custom required, but not more. To say Mattins or Evensong before preaching a sermon, and to omit, maybe, part of the *Benedicite*, or the whole of the Athanasian Creed; to say, on Sundays and

* James ii. 22.

one or two holy-days, part of the Eucharistic Office in addition (omitting, however, the Offertory-sentences and the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church), were duties which custom required, and which therefore might, presumably, if neglected, be enforced by law; and these duties, therefore, Low-Church clergymen found it necessary to observe. But in cases where, through the general laxity, liberty was allowed by the authorities, it was plainly apparent how little weight Church principles had with Low-Churchmen. Daily public worship was allowed to become obsolete, and the general system of festivals and fasts was ignored. With Low-Churchmen, Church order was an appendage to religion, not a part of it; and it was an appendage, too, more or less in the way. Therefore, in invoking the law, or rather the powers of the State, against Ritualists, they did so not for the purpose of enforcing a common religion, but merely for the purpose of either forcing Ritualists to adopt the expression of Low-Church religion, or making the Church-Establishment too hot to hold them. It was as though a smuggler should prosecute a revenue-officer on the ground of some alleged breach of the law, not with the object of compelling the officer to observe the law, but with the object of getting rid of him, if possible, altogether; and further, in the hope of diverting the attention of the authorities from the smuggler's own illicit practices.

In such a one-sided manner was the Act to be worked; as indeed had been intended from the first

by its promoters. Who should be the first clergyman to be attacked under it by the "Church Association?" The Archbishop of Canterbury had already taken proceedings twice over against a clergyman of his diocese—the Rev. Charles Joseph Ridsdale, Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Folkestone—for the ritual used in his church; but the prosecution had failed in each case. The first proceedings had been quashed by the Archbishop's own diocesan judge, on the ground that Mr. Ridsdale and his churchwardens had been brought into court by a monition purporting to be the mere personal act of the Archbishop, not issuing from his court, and naming no prosecutor or complainant against whom answer could be made.* And the second proceedings had been quashed in the same way on the application of the churchwardens, and on the ground that Mr. Lee, the nominal promoter, who had described himself as merely residing in Broad-Sanctuary, Westminster, showed no "interest" in the affairs of a church at Folkestone.† Now, however, Mr. Ridsdale became the object of attack by the "Church Association." Three persons were openly hired by the agents of the Association to come forward as aggrieved parishioners—William Clifton, a baker, of Saffron's Place, Dover Street; George Miller, of 28 Dover Street; and James Harris, of 24 Dover Street. Of these, Clifton, by his own account, professed no religion at all. A person of the name of Wightwick, who

* Letter from Dr. Walter Phillimore to the *Times*, reprinted in the *Church Times* of November 30, 1877.

† He was, in fact, the Archbishop's Secretary.

appears to have been Mayor of Folkestone, and a member of the “Church Association,” called upon him and asked whether he would oblige him by attending a service at St. Peter’s Church. Not liking to refuse, he consented, and went to St. Peter’s with his daughter, though he had never attended that church before; and he afterwards declared that he had not seen any grounds of objection in the way in which the service was conducted. To oblige Mr. Wightwick again, however, he signed a paper—a similar one, no doubt, to what was proposed and signed in similar “Church Association” prosecutions—authorising the lawyers of the Association to act for him, and accepting a guarantee on the part of the Association to the effect that he should be reimbursed in all costs which he might incur in process of the suit.

Some time afterwards, Clifton expressed regret at having been (as he said) “made a tool of;” but on its being pointed out to him that he could revoke the proxy which he had given, he declined doing so without advice. Harris, another of the nominal promoters of the suit, expressed willingness to revoke his proxy if Clifton would revoke his; but the latter, after some further delay, only consented on condition of being paid a sum of two hundred pounds.*

So much for the three who posed as aggrieved by Mr. Ridsdale’s proceedings in church. The

* Letter from the Rev. Matthew Woodward, Vicar of Folkestone, to the *Daily Express*; reprinted in the Rev. C. S. Grueber’s letter to the Bishop of Bath and Wells on *The Recent Judgment, Ridsdale v. Clifton*.

charges put forward in their name were as follows :—

1. The use of lighted candles on the Communion-table, or on a ledge immediately over it, at the time of the celebration of the Holy Communion, when those candles were not required for giving light.

2. The mixing of water with wine for the service of the Holy Communion.

3. The use of wafer-bread instead of bread such as is usually eaten in the administration of the Holy Communion.

4. Standing in the middle of the west side of the Communion-table with his back to the people so that the people could not see him break the bread during the Prayer of Consecration.

5. Kneeling during the Prayer of Consecration.

6. Causing the hymn or prayer commonly known as the *Agnus Dei* to be sung during the Communion Service immediately after the Prayer of Consecration.

7. Forming and accompanying a procession consisting of a choir and two acolytes in short surplices and red cassocks ; four banners, a brass instrument, and a processional cross being carried in it ; the choir singing a hymn, and the Respondent walking in it with a cap called a biretta on his head ; such procession taking place after the service of Morning Prayer and immediately before the Communion.

8. Forming and accompanying a like procession on another occasion, when at one period of it all those who took part in it fell on their knees and remained kneeling for some time.

9. Wearing certain unlawful ecclesiastical vestments, viz. an alb and a chasuble, while administering the Holy Communion.

10. Consecrating and receiving the elements when only one person communicated with the Respondent.

11. Without lawful authority, setting up and placing upon the top of a rood-screen, and retaining there, a crucifix and twenty-four candlesticks with candles, the candles being lighted on either side of the crucifix, and so continued lighted, although not required for giving light.

12. Unlawfully setting up and placing in his church certain representations of figures, forming what are called Stations of the Cross, such as are used in Roman Catholic churches, which tend to encourage ideas and devotions of a superstitious kind.—The last three charges were not in the original representation, but added afterwards.

It will be observed that some of the things thus charged against Mr. Ridsdale were in principle no more than what was done by numerous Low-Church clergymen already. For if it was illegal to interpolate after the Prayer of Consecration a hymn taken from the Prayer-book, it must also have been illegal to interpolate a hymn and prayers after the Nicene Creed, such hymn, and sometimes the prayer also, not being found in the Prayer-book at all. If it was illegal for Mr. Ridsdale to walk last in a procession after the manner described in charge 7, it must have been illegal for a Low-Church dean to walk last in a procession of choristers and clergy, and with silver staves carried before him. Again,

if it was illegal to kneel after the manner specified in charge 8, how could it be legal for the dean, clergy, and choristers to kneel down and pray secretly on arriving at their several seats or stalls, instead of commencing the service at once? And, once more, if several pictures called Stations of the Cross were illegal, what legality could there be in numerous "altar-pieces" to be seen in college-chapels and parish churches? With regard, too, to the 10th charge, how, it might be asked, was the celebrant to know that there would be only one communicant besides himself, when the church was full of people?

The case came before Lord Penzance on the 4th of January, 1876. On this occasion Mr. Ridsdale did not refuse to appear. Mr. Benjamin Shaw was counsel for the "Church Association;" and it is to be observed that he had expressed the opinion distinctly that the Eucharistic vestments were legal, but foretold that the Judicial Committee of Privy Council would decide against them on grounds of expediency. In reference to the Stations of the Cross, and with a view to prejudicing the judge as to their Popish character, the Rev. Dominic Crescitielli, Priest of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church, Hatton Garden, was called to give evidence. On the 3rd of ensuing February judgment was given. Mr. Ridsdale was declared to have violated the law on all the first ten charges. With regard to the eleventh and twelfth, the court ordered the crucifix and the "Stations of the Cross" to be removed. And Mr. Ridsdale was condemned in the costs.

To this judgment Mr. Ridsdale determined to submit, save on four points—the subject-matter of the third, fourth, ninth, and eleventh charges severally. On those points he appealed to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council; and under a provision of the Public Worship Regulation Act Lord Penzance was asked to suspend his monition until such time as the appeal should be decided. This, however, Lord Penzance declined to do. Thereupon an application was made to the Registrar of the Appeal Court for an inhibition on Lord Penzance. A caveat, however, was lodged by the “Church Association,” and Mr. Ridsdale had therefore to apply to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council; and their Lordships, in granting an inhibition, limited it to that part of Lord Penzance’s decree which ordered the removal of the crucifix. No order, however, was made as to costs. The appeal was argued in January 1877 before the Judicial Committee, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury (his Grace not seeing any indecency in his sitting to judge a cause in which he was already interested against the appellant), the Lord Chancellor (Earl Cairns), the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Lord Selborne, the Lord Chief Baron (Sir Fitzroy Kelly), Lord Justice Brett, Mr. Baron Amphlett, Sir J. Colville, Sir Montague Smith, Sir W. M. James, Sir Robert Collier, and Sir Robert Phillimore. Judgment was delivered on the 12th of May, 1877, and was read by the Presbyterian Earl Cairns, the other Lords of the Committee being present, except Lord Chief Baron Kelly, Mr. Baron Amphlett, and Sir Robert Phillimore. It was rumoured that Sir James

Hannen and Lord Coleridge had been prevented from sitting to hear the appeal by a strongly worded letter from a high official quarter.* As to wearing the alb and chasuble, the court held that the Ornaments' Rubric was not meant to be an enactment at all; and that the law as to vestments was to be found in certain advertisements drawn up in 1564 by Archbishop Parker for the direction of the Province of Canterbury, but concerning which he complained in his correspondence that he could not get the Queen's authority for them, and a copy of which her Prime Minister Cecil endorsed in these terms:—"These were not authorised nor published." These points had been brought before their Lordships, but on the strength of these advertisements the Court ruled that the only vestments to be worn by priests or deacons were, the surplice in parish churches, and the surplice and cope in cathedrals: for, said their Lordships, it was not seriously contended that albs or chasubles could in any practical sense be worn concurrently with the surplice. As to the position of the minister when consecrating the elements, the court held it to be his duty to stand at that side of the table which was next the north; and that the words "before the table," in connexion with the manual acts, were meant to be equivalent to "in the sight of the people." Wafer-bread, properly so-called, was illegal: the words "it shall suffice," used in the rubric concerning ordinary bread, meaning, apparently, that nothing else was allowable. The decision of Lord Penzance was

* *Church Times*, November 9, 1877, p. 627.

affirmed in regard to the crucifix, and on the whole the decree of the noble Lord was confirmed in all points save as regards the position of Mr. Ridsdale and his use of wafers; in regard of which the charges against him were not held to have been proved as to the facts. The costs in Lord Penzance's court were to be paid by the "Church Association," and there were to be no costs in the appeal.

This judgment was pronounced as that of the whole court of the Judicial Committee. Afterwards Chief Baron Kelly published a pamphlet in which he stated that he himself and two other members of the Committee had dissented from it. And in March 1882 the Vicar of Folkestone, after recapitulating at a meeting of the Folkestone branch of the English Church Union the marvellous pretexts which their Lordships had assigned as the grounds of the judgment, continued his speech thus:—"After this, I was not surprised when the late Lord Chief Baron said to me in my study at West Terrace, 'It is an iniquitous judgment, Mr. Woodward: the result of policy and not of law.'" And well indeed might it be so stigmatised. And the true character of it was curiously brought out in the following June by one of the very judges in whose name it was pronounced—even by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself: when, after a correspondence with Mr. Ridsdale, the Archbishop professed to give, and Mr. Ridsdale professed to receive, a dispensation absolving him from the obligation of using the alb, the chasuble, the altar-lights, and the mixed chalice. Yes, a

dispensation; thus tacitly implying that the vestments, lights, and mixed chalice were ordinarily of obligation on priests ministering in the Church of England. Mr. Ridsdale, however, told his congregation that he intended to obey this "enforced dispensation" (as he called it) only until Convocation should have had fitting opportunity for deliberating as to the propriety of giving such a dispensation.

It ought, moreover, to be mentioned here that one of the members of the Judicial Committee who assented to the Ridsdale Judgment, to wit, Lord Justice James, had some ten years before, when a plain Queen's Counsel, expressed himself thus:—
 "1. I am of opinion that the use of the vestments is clearly legal. 2. I am unable to bring my mind to entertain a doubt upon the subject." He could understand a defence set up against such proceedings as might be taken to enforce the use of vestments, if such defence proceeded on the ground of disuse during a long period of time; but he saw no ground for imputing illegality to those who declined to avail themselves of such excuse. His Lordship's remarkable change of mind gave rise to the following epigram:—

"What James, Q.C., confessed he clearly saw,
 A judge become, he stoutly now denies:
 For when he added Justice to his name,
 He also put her bandage off his eyes."*

The effects produced in the Low-Church party by the Ridsdale Judgment were not altogether uniform. Generally speaking, indeed, Low-Church-

* *Church Times*, May 25, 1877.

men were glad at the decision, because, however iniquitous, it was mainly in favour of them. Now and then, however, the Low-Church utterances concerning it betrayed a consciousness that, although the utterance of authority, it did not really declare the law. Thus, the "Church Association," while gloating over it in their report for 1875, spoke of it as *proving* what was the law; as if to prove a position were the office of any judge at all: and thus tacitly admitting that the positions thus said to have been proved had previously been matters of actual denial. One learned counsel on the Low-Church side, when making a speech in court, spoke of the law as having been altered by the Ridsdale Judgment; and the remark, itself an insult to every free and freedom-loving Englishman, was allowed to pass uncorrected and unchallenged. One Low-Church clergyman, however, considering that the Judicial Committee had not condemned the eastward position absolutely as involving the idea of a sacrificial act done towards God, and considering also, perhaps, that the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist had in the Bennett case been ruled permissible in the Church of England, thought it incumbent upon him, being a staunch Protestant, to resign his benefice. This was the Rev. Dr. Gregg, who afterwards sought, and with some difficulty received, a questionable consecration to the Episcopate, from that Reformed Episcopal Church (so-called) in America which derives its succession from the suspended Bishop Cummins. Previously to Dr. Gregg's secession from the Church of England he had been Vicar of

East Harborne, near Birmingham, in the Diocese of Lichfield. And another Low-Church clergyman, considering that the Judicial Committee, in declaring the surplice to be the only legal vestment for use by priests and deacons in parish churches, had in effect condemned the black gown, announced his intention of wearing the surplice in his pulpit thenceforward, and (if we remember right) of conforming to the rubric in some points in which Low-Churchmen in general were in the habit of breaking it. This, however, raised a wail of protest from the Rev. Edward Auriol, Rector of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, London, to the effect that the line thus proposed to be taken was tantamount to admitting general wrong-doing by the Low-Church party in the matters in question. And Mr. Auriol's protest expressed very well what was the general feeling of Low-Churchmen, viz. that both the Public Worship Regulation Act and its administrators were on the side of Low-Churchmen as against High-Churchmen, and that therefore Low-Churchmen might go on in their old ways without troubling themselves about law. It became, indeed, a matter of scandal that those who were most zealous in seeking to enforce the Ridsdale Judgment upon High-Churchmen, set an example themselves of violating its decisions; for in cathedrals, where the use of the cope was ruled imperative in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, Church bishops, Low-Church deans, and Low-Church canons and prebendaries still continued to officiate without it.

CHAPTER LXII.

Immoral Period, continued. Refusal of certain Bishops to license Curates for High-Churchmen. Persecution of the Rev. A. Tooth. Riotous and Profane Conduct of Protestants at St. James's, Hatcham.

The Queen was in the counting-house,
 Counting out her money :
 The Bishop in the garden,
 Talking to his honey.
 The Church was in the suburbs,
 Teaching of the truth—
 Pop came a State Judge,
 And pulled out A TOOTH.

A New Reading of an Old Rhyme.

COMING back now to the year 1876, we have to note that Low-Church bishops had by this time hit upon a new device for stamping out Ritualism. Bishop Sumner of Winchester had, we believe, persistently refused to ordain any man to the diaconate on the title given by the Rev. John Keble, Vicar of Hursley, and author of the *Christian Year*. The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring) had refused to license any clergyman to serve as curate in Dr. Dykes's parish (that of St. Oswald in the city of Durham), for no other reason than that Dr. Dykes refused to alter his ritual—permissible by the Prayer-book—according to the private opinion of his diocesan. And now, owing to this conduct of the Bishop, Dr. Dykes, crushed by the work which was thus thrown upon him—for the population of the parish was 4,938—had died, January 22, 1876.

The Rev. H. Greenwell also, Vicar of St. Bar-

nabas's, Leeds, when needing a few months' relaxation on account of broken health, asked his diocesan, the Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Robert Bickersteth), to allow the Rev. W. Green Armytage and the Rev. R. Ralph Blakelocke to do the parochial duty for six months; but the Bishop refused until such time as Mr. Greenwell should (as he expressed it) "obey the law," *i.e.* conform to the dicta of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. This was in November. In the preceding April, objection having been made by certain persons to statues of the Blessed Virgin and the four Latin Doctors, which had been erected as ornaments to the porch of Bristol Cathedral, with the consent of the Dean and Chapter, the Dean (Dr. Eliot, of whom we shall hear more anon in connexion with the proceedings of certain Dissenters) ordered their removal; and they were removed accordingly.

The circumstances which we have to bring before our readers now will recall those which had brought so peculiar a notoriety upon the parish of St. George's-in-the-East about seventeen years before. The Church of St. James, Hatcham, Deptford, was built about 1845 by the Rev. A. K. B. Granville, who became its first incumbent. The patronage of the benefice was purchased afterwards by R. Tooth, Esq., who, after the living had become vacant, presented his brother, the Rev. Arthur Tooth, in 1868. Under the new incumbent, both the fabric of the church and the services inside were improved, and the spiritual life of the congregation seemed to advance. Mr. Tooth made the whole church free and open, content with the £150 per

annum given by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and a monthly collection, besides what private means he had of his own.

For about eight years Mr. Tooth had been working as priest of the parish, in harmony with his congregation, until a person named Sanders came into the parish. This man appears to have formed what was called a "Parish Committee," which, being practically in league with the "Church Association," aimed at hindering the Vicar's work in every way, in the interests of Protestantism. And in the spring of 1876 the "Church Association" instituted proceedings against Mr. Tooth, under the Public Worship Regulation Act.* The three persons who posed as aggrieved parishioners were Robert Hudson, Samuel Gardiner, and Robert Gunston; of whom one admitted to Mr. Tooth that the good offices of the Evangelical clergyman of his own choice failed to satisfy him, and that he found the exhortations of a Wesleyan minister more to the point.†

Eighteen charges were brought against Mr. Tooth, who was given to understand that if he did not accept the Bishop's decision thereon the case would be sent to Lord Penzance.‡ It was asserted that Mr. Tooth had adopted the following practices :§—

A procession from the vestry to the Communion-

* The proceedings "were guided by the Council of the Association." *Church Association Monthly Intelligencer*, April 2, 1877, p. 107.

† Letter of Mr. Tooth to the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Thomas Legh Cloughton), in *Church Times* of March 24, 1876.

‡ *Church Times*, March 10, 1876, p. 120.

§ The particulars are taken from the *Church Association Monthly Intelligencer* for 1876.

table, upon which or the ledge immediately above which candles have just been lighted. This procession consists of boys in cassocks carrying incense, lighted candles, and a crucifix on a pole, and is attended by Mr. Tooth himself, or by his curate in an alb, girdle, amice, stole, and a chasuble, with a cap called a biretta on his head. . . . The different vessels are censed. The biretta is taken off the head and laid with ceremony on the table. Water is mixed with the wine. The prayer of consecration is said with the back of the celebrant turned to the congregation. The celebrant kneels at certain parts of it, and afterwards elevates the sacred elements above his head. He makes the sign of the cross in the air towards the congregation; the *Agnus Dei* is sung; the great bell of the church is tolled; two boys hold up lighted candles high in the air and retire; and the Holy Communion is then received either by the celebrant himself alone or by himself and one other person.

The case was sent to Lord Penzance, who sat on the 13th of July to hear it. And on the 18th he gave judgment; ordering a monition to issue, bidding Mr. Tooth to refrain from these various practices in future, and to pay the costs. At the same time the crucifix on the beam crossing the nave of the church, and the altar in the south aisle were ordered by his Lordship to be removed.

Lord Penzance's monition was served on Mr. Tooth on the 29th of July. Mr. Tooth paid no regard to it; in consequence of which application was made for an inhibition to enforce obedience. Mr. Tooth was cited to appear before Lord Penzance on the 2nd of December, 1876. Not recog-

nising any spiritual authority as possessed by Lord Penzance, he did not appear; and sentence of suspension was passed. The sentence was not served, however, until Sunday, the 17th of December. When it was served, Mr. Tooth ignored it; and on that day fortnight, the 31st, the church was invaded by an organised mob, which sang comic songs in the course of the service and hooted the congregation as they left. One member of the "Church Association" was among them whose countenance betrayed anything but displeasure at what was going on; * and who thus manifested himself a true follower of some of the old Puritans. † After the service the mob was harangued by "Church Association" agitators outside, and urged to violence. "A pretty set of fellows!" one of these agitators was afterwards heard to say; "they didn't half do what they were paid for." The result of this was, that after the Evening Service it was with difficulty that the clergy could get safely to the vicarage adjoining. ‡

* Letter in *Church Times* of January 5, 1877, p. 4.

† Foxe speaks of some Protestants as mocking Catholics for attending church. *Acts and Monuments*, vol. viii. p. 382.

‡ *Church Times*, January 5, 1877. It was subsequently stated (*Church Times*, August 26, 1887, p. 675, vol. iii.) that the leaders of the rioting invited a working-man to join their committee who was a member of the Church of England Working Men's Association, then in its infancy. Possibly those who invited him had never heard of the Association, or did not know its principles. Be that as it may, however, invited he was. "He was a shrewd fellow, who knew how to hold his tongue; and having been invited, without any sinister action of his own, to join the enemy, he consented, on the principle that all was fair in love or in war; and in this case it was decidedly war. Of course everything which was arranged by the rioting party was known to him, and he duly reported it at head-quarters. Consequently on

In order to exclude the mob on the following Sunday, the churchwardens determined to admit the regular congregation by ticket. The enemy became aware of this, and on the Monday morning following the day of riot, an order was given to a firm of stationers for three hundred facsimiles of the churchwardens' ticket. Fortunately, however, the order was entrusted to the same house which the churchwardens themselves had employed, and the trick in consequence failed. Next Sunday (the 7th of January, 1877), the mob broke down a barrier which the churchwardens had had erected, invaded the churchyard, and made a noise at the church-doors, by kicking at them and otherwise, while Divine Service was proceeding. And when the congregation were departing, the same insulting and abominable language was used towards them which had been used before. Two ladies were spat upon, and one of the crowd was heard to say, "We have lots of money, and we will get hundreds of men from Deptford to come next Sunday, and then we will never rest until we throug the church, smash everything in the chancel, and pull down everything in the church."* The wife of one afterwards said, "My husband did well yesterday: he got a sovereign for rowing at the church, and each following Sunday, steps were taken to checkmate the designs of the rioters. After a time the Protestant body discovered that there must be some enemy in the camp, and it was proposed that an oath of secrecy should be taken by their committee. Of course the Church of England Working Men's Society man could not do this, and he excused himself by saying that such action was illegal, and that as he was not going to lay himself open to prosecution he should retire from the committee. But the worst was over then as regarded the rioting in the church."

* *Church Times*, January 12, 1877.

so did all the men, and the boys a shilling each." When next Sunday came, however, the police hindered the accomplishment of the threat. The church was not opened at all, the Bishop having ordered it to be closed : and the mob which had assembled was dispersed by a heavy rain. On the 21st also the church remained shut up.

Meanwhile Mr. Tooth was doing his duty as best he could under the circumstances : stedfastly refusing to recognise the Public Worship Regulation Act, or the pretended spiritual authority of Lord Penzance's court, in any way ; and refusing to obey the Bishop also, when that right reverend Father acted merely as Lord Penzance's tipstaff. On these accounts he was signified, on Saturday, the 13th of January, for contempt of court, arrested on the afternoon of Monday, the 22nd, and imprisoned in Horsemonger Gaol. He was, however, released again on the 17th of February ; the promoters being in a manner compelled by public opinion to apply for his release, and doing so unwillingly enough.

The Bishop tried to get one clergyman after another to do duty in Mr. Tooth's church. He had in the previous December revoked the licence of the Rev. William Henry Browne, Mr. Tooth's curate, and had appointed in his place the Rev. Dr. Gee, one of the episcopal chaplains, whose attempts to intrude into the church Mr. Tooth had successfully resisted. The Rev. Richard Chambres was then appointed ; but Mr. Tooth refused him the keys of the church, whereupon he gave up the matter as a bad job. The curacy was then offered

by the Bishop to a clergyman of the name of Peake ; who declined it. At last the office of intruder was accepted by a clergyman of the name of Dale ; who thus gave occasion for the lines—

“ What lofty Peake looked down on with disdain,
Low-lying Dale was but too glad to gain.”

This gentleman could not get the keys of the church from anybody ; for vicar and churchwardens were of one mind with regard to him. A locksmith was brought, and attempted to pick the locks, but failed. Finally, a crowbar was brought to bear upon the sacred fabric ; and some masonry having been therewith displaced, an entrance was effected ; and the intruder said Mattins and Litany in the church on Sunday, February 25. After the Litany a large number of the congregation, not wishing to be present at Mr. Dale's celebration of the Eucharist, rose from their seats to go ; and about two-thirds of these had left the church, when several members of the Protestant League closed and bolted the western doors, thus preventing further egress until, on the arrival of Mr. Croom, one of the churchwardens, they were partially opened again. Mr. Croom, however, was seized by the throat and thrown down the steps ; after which the doors were again fastened, and the Catholics inside compelled to remain at a service which they deemed sacrilegious.

On Saturday night, March 24, or early on the following morning, certain paintings on the chancel-screen were daubed over with paint of a dark slate-colour. That Sunday was the Sunday before

Easter; and apparently in the following week a person named Fry, one of Mr. Tooth's opponents, was put into the office of churchwarden; the other churchwarden being Mr. Webb, appointed by Mr. Tooth. When the Bishop came to do duty himself at St. James's, in the absence of Mr. Tooth, on Good Friday, he saw Fry, Holloway, and two other Low-Churchmen in the vestry after the Morning Service, and shook hands with them, saying, "God bless you."

Mr. Tooth himself had gone abroad for the sake of his health, and had written to the churchwardens recommending the congregation to discontinue their attendance at St. James's Church as long as it remained in the hands of an intruder. On the Eve of Ascension Day, however, he returned to England, and on Ascension Day, in the evening, he came to his vicarage, and wrote to Mr. Webb. We shall give his letter, and the narrative of what followed, as they were communicated to the *Church Times*:—*

" St. James's Vicarage, Hatcham,
" May 12, 1877.

" My dear Churchwarden,—I have returned to London—(1) to renew my claim to my position as the lawful and canonically instituted vicar of this parish; (2) to assert that all services which have been conducted here since my removal from my parish are schismatical; and (3) that the various appointments to the cure of souls which have been forced upon my parishioners, from the nature of the case, must be null and void. Will you kindly

* *Church Times*, May 18, 1877.

inform the communicants of the congregation, as far as you have the opportunity of doing so, that it is my intention on Sunday (the first after my return) to celebrate the Holy Communion at 8 o'clock.

“I wish it to be understood that I reserve it as a matter for my own discretion to say when I shall repeat my ministrations—not elsewhere in my parish—but in my own pulpit and at my own altar.

“Believe me to remain, my dear Churchwarden, yours faithfully and affectionately,

“ARTHUR TOOTH.”

“It would have been the merest affectation of confidence for Mr. Tooth to have communicated with the other churchwarden, Mr. Fry, for he has left no room for doubt as to his mind and attitude by repeated acts of hostility from before the commencement of the prosecution until the other day, when he broke up and removed the altar in the side-chapel, making this use of the opportunity afforded to him by Mr. Dale's having entrusted him with the keys that he might open the church for the clergyman who was to take the duty on the following Sunday. But if he was not to be trusted others were; and the news was spread abroad amongst a number of the communicants and other friends with a rapidity and secrecy worthy of the occasion; and by 8 o'clock on Sunday morning a large congregation had assembled—the body of the church being well filled. The bell having been rung for five minutes according to the old custom,

the Vicar entered the chancel and proceeded to the altar attended by another priest who acted as server, while a lay assistant occupied one of the choir stalls. When Mr. Tooth had placed the chalice on the altar, he and all the people recited the fifty-first Psalm. But for this, and the interruption to be mentioned presently, one might have thought it was some greater 'White' Sunday in last year, for one hardly observed the absence of the vesper lights, candlesticks, and of the altar-frontal; and the blackened panels of the rood-screen were not visible except to the foremost rows of kneeling worshippers. The Eucharistic lights burning on either side of the altar-cross, the rich festal vestments which were used, the bell tolled at the *Sanctus* and at the Elevation, and the devotion of the people, all served to carry us back to the happy days gone by, and to muffle the remembrance of the sacrilegious communions and the open irreverence and profanity which had lately desecrated the house of God.

“The sound of the bell before the service produced different effects upon different people. A member of the old congregation, who had been overlooked in the issuing of the notices, on hearing it exclaimed, ‘That is no Protestant ring!’ and hastened to the church to receive Communion there once more from the Vicar’s hands, instead of making a journey to St. Peter’s. Mr. Fry, however, having no notion of an early Communion, was sleeping the sleep of the true Protestant, whose ideas of the sabbatical nature of the Sunday are strongly developed in a particular direction. Wakened by

the bell, he skipped out of bed with uncalculating precipitation, and sent his maidservant to the church to ask if there was any service, and who was the minister. As he heard from her nothing tending to soothe him, he hurried up to the church himself, completing his toilet on the way. Peeping in through the curtains at the west door, he saw the Vicar turning to the people to give the absolution, and he bounded up the nave, followed by the two policemen he had brought with him. His progress was arrested by the chancel gates, which were closed against him; the congregation rose to a man, and many rushed forward to the chancel steps on which he was standing.

“Thus balked, he called out in a loud tone, ‘Mr. Webb! Mr. Webb! Mr. Webb!’ and Mr. Webb, who was already close to him, replied, ‘I am here, Mr. Fry, to do my duty.’ Then Mr. Fry said to the police, ‘I give Mr. Tooth in charge; take that man into custody.’ Mr. Webb turned to the police and said, ‘You’ll do nothing of the kind;’ whereupon Mr. Fry said to his colleague, ‘You won’t support my action?’ and received for an answer, ‘No! and you cannot do anything without me: one churchwarden cannot act by himself’—a statement which was endorsed by another gentleman.* Mr. Fry then turned to Mr. Tooth and cried out with a loud voice, ‘Mr. Tooth, will you speak to me? Mr. Tooth, you are prohibited from officiating, and I, as churchwarden, call upon you to desist.’ Mr.

* And it was intimated by another gentleman that though Mr. Fry must not attempt any violence, the police were welcome to arrest Mr. Tooth if they pleased.

Tooth, however, neither spoke nor moved, but stood calmly waiting throughout the whole scene. As Mr. Fry was very boisterous, even after he had found that he was helpless, Mr. Webb told him, ‘If you persist in interrupting the service, I shall have to give you into custody for brawling,’ whereupon he went away with the police, but returned presently with his friend Mr. Sanders, one of his sidesmen, with whom he stood near the rood-screen, commenting in an audible tone on what was taking place, and noting, let us hope, the reverent demeanour of the hundred and odd who received the Blessed Sacrament.

“The scene, after the first moment of alarm, was not so tumultuous as might be supposed; for when it was clear that there was no fear of a sudden rush at the Vicar, and that the police were ready to listen to reason and not to Mr. Fry, all but a small group who stood round the chancel steps obeyed the request of Mr. Layman to resume their places; and when the disturbance was over, the Vicar pronounced the absolution just as if no disagreeable occurrence had happened, and the service was proceeded with to the end without any tokens of excitement, though, as may be imagined, not a few found considerable difficulty in repressing their conflicting emotions of sorrow, love, and joy.

“*O passi graviora! Dabit Deus his quoque finem.*

Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.’

“On Mr. Tooth’s returning to the sacristy to unvest, Mr. Fry followed, with his friend, and

addressed the Vicar, saying, 'I protest against your being here;' to which the Vicar answered 'Yes!' 'You have been inhibited from performing any service in this church.' 'Yes!' again replied the Vicar. 'I protest against your action;' to which Mr. Tooth again simply answered 'Yes!' Some eight or ten members of the congregation had followed Mr. Fry into the sacristy, and now seemed disposed to resent his interference; whereupon Mr. Webb, with a praiseworthy sense of fairness, interposed, saying that Mr. Fry was perfectly within his right in making his protest.

"The vestments, &c., which had been brought in for the service were removed, and the bulk of the congregation left the church, offering their congratulations and welcomes to the Vicar as he walked along the path they lined to the vicarage, which he entered with his old friend and churchwarden, Mr. Croom. A few members of the congregation remained in the church, but as soon as Mr. Tooth heard of it he gave directions that they should at once leave quietly and orderly. He had no wish, he said, to pursue an advantage; the service was complete in itself, and had effected all that was required. Mr. Fry, having locked up the church, hurried off to obtain some policemen, and the news of what had happened spread rapidly among Mr. Fry's friends and supporters of the discredited 'Protestant League,' some of whom were overheard saying they only 'wished they had known this before.' At eleven o'clock a schismatical service was conducted by a Mr. M'Bean, who is said to have come down at the pressing request of the

Bishop, but who appears to think no new glory of this world is likely to attach to his name in consequence of his compliance. Some thirty policemen were on duty round the church, and the most valiant of the 'Protestant League' stood about the doors, declaring that they would not allow Mr. Tooth to enter the building. Any occupation is good for little wits, and we do not grudge them their little display—but we are sorry for the unfortunate policemen who were there without reason, for Mr. Tooth had no intention of going to the church, as his work was accomplished. Night and day, up to the time of our writing, the police have been watching the church, on whose walls they now and then gaze as if they wished some good (or bad) angel would fly away with it, and plant it near the bishop who was wafted away to the desert of Sahara.

“By way of a piece of senseless spite, which could in no way injure the Vicar, nor alter the effect of his action, the Protestants, with characteristic 'simplicity,' began on Sunday to damage the confessional; but were stopped before they had gone far in their congenial work of destroying what they do not understand.

“On Tuesday night, some of Mr. Fry's party went into the church and continued his work, the demolition of the side-altar, using its pieces for boarding up one of the windows, and on Wednesday a party of workmen brought long ladders and, as it turns out, threw down the crucifix from the rood-beam. It came down with a great crash, which startled the people in the neighbouring houses, and it

was, of course, broken. That the intention was to break it is clear, from the use of ladders instead of scaffolding ; and Mr. Fry will have to answer for this, as well as for tearing the side-altar to pieces. His conduct, on the one side, stands in strong contrast to the dignified moderation of Mr. Webb on the other side. The latter gentleman, though he may be howled at by the insolent and aggressive faction which is dominant at Hatcham, must be admitted to have behaved with the utmost moderation, and while Churchmen are bound to thank him for his courage and his readiness and efficiency, he is not really open to censure from thoughtful people on the other side, unless, indeed, to censure for holding an unpopular creed. His position clearly is that the Vicar, as freeholder, has a right of entry to the church, and that while it was no affair of his to 'sanction' the service (as he is falsely reported to have declared he did), it was his duty to protect from interruption a service conducted by the Vicar, who had a *prima facie* right to conduct it, and who, if he were wrong, could be dealt with by the law.

“On Thursday morning Mr. Fry, who has the keys of the church, refused to give Mr. Webb access, although he knows by experience that Mr. Webb would have returned them if he received them on that understanding.”

A meeting of parishioners was announced by the Protestant League, of which Lord Oranmore and Browne was president, to be held on the 18th of May. “At half-past six o'clock,” says a reporter or correspondent of the *Church Times*, “the time

announced for the commencement of the proceedings, not twenty persons were present, and a start was not managed for nearly an hour later. The resolutions, we learn from the *Standard*, were declared carried without putting to the contrary. To show the great interest manifested by the parishioners in the cause of Protestantism, we may remark that four out of the five speakers were non-parishioners, including Mr. McClure, of Greenwich. Mr. James Ross, of Bow, and secretary of a Conservative association of working men, was very conspicuous and energetic in his efforts in the cause of the 'poor suffering parishioners.'* *

On the 12th of July, 1877, the Court of Queen's Bench granted a rule *nisi* to show cause why the proceedings against Mr. Tooth should not be quashed on the ground of a technical informality; the Judge having been enjoined in the Archbishop's requisition to hear the case in London, Westminster, or the Diocese of Rochester; whereas he had heard it in Lambeth Palace, which was within neither of those localities. The case was heard before the Lord Chief Justice (Lord Coleridge), Mr. Justice Mellor, and Mr. Justice Lush, on the 19th of November; and the Court decided unanimously that the prohibition must issue. Prohibition was issued accordingly to the promoters of the suit, and to Lord Penzance, against taking any further steps in the matter.

It will already have been evident that in the case of St. James's, Hatcham, the hatred and malice of the Low-Church party was directed as

* *Church Times*, May 25, 1877.

much against the fabric and furniture of the sacred edifice as against the priest who ministered in it. A man named John Elliot, a carpenter, and member of the Protestant League, thinking one day that he would like to bear a hand in the pious business, broke up the confessional-box. For this offence he was prosecuted by one of the churchwardens, and tried at the Old Bailey, in the month of August, before Mr. Commissioner Kerr and a jury. Before, however, the case for the prosecution had been fully stated the jury interposed, and intimated that on the sole ground that the confessional-box had been shaken by other persons before, so as to have become already rickety, they had made up their minds to acquit the prisoner; whereupon Mr. Commissioner Kerr had no alternative save to suggest that the prosecution should be withdrawn. This bold perjury on the part of the jury was designated by the *Daily Telegraph* as "A very significant vindication of Protestant principles."

In the month of November Mr. Tooth wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury (who, since the departure of Bishop Thomas Legh Claughton to the newly-founded See of St. Alban's, and before the consecration of Mr. Thorold to the See of Rochester in its new shape, had, as Metropolitan of the province, taken charge of the latter diocese), intimating his intention of resigning the benefice of St. James's. The late decision of the Queen's Bench in his favour had placed it within Mr. Tooth's power to bring actions at law against various persons at whose hands he had suffered injury.

He could have prosecuted Bishop Thomas Legh Cloughton, and all those clergymen who had been intruded into his church, for trespass on his freehold. He could have prosecuted the three "aggrieved parishioners" (so called) and Lord Penzance for false imprisonment. And he could have prosecuted also the parishioners' churchwarden, and perhaps the intruding clergyman also, for the damage done to the fabric and furniture of the church, whereof they had been either custodians or in the place of such; which damage might have included—we are not aware whether it did actually include—the removal, on the 14th of November, of an oaken triptych from over the altar—by whom, nobody professed to know. All these rights, however, and the compensatory damages which he might have obtained if he had pressed for them, Mr. Tooth freely waived. He resigned his benefice, and retired to the orphanage of which he had the superintendence.

The Low-Church enemies at Hatcham, however, had not done with St. James's Church, if they had lost their gripe of Mr. Tooth. In January 1878 Mr. Fry, the parishioners' churchwarden, instituted proceedings in the Consistory Court of Rochester for the removing of the screens, the lowering of the altar, and effecting other injuries to the interior of the building. His petition was granted, and, oddly enough, on the day of the Epiphany, by Dr. Robertson, the chancellor of the diocese. An appeal was made on the 23rd of March to Lord Penzance, at the instance of a Mr. Bradford; two other parishioners, Mr. Bullard and Mr. Nash,

having been allowed to intervene. But Lord Penzance decided that the beautiful oak screen in the south transept, which screen was a memorial of Mrs. Tooth, the wife of the patron, together with the chancel-gates and some of the altar-steps, must be removed.

In the February of the same year there was an organised attempt on the part of the leaders of the Protestant League to disturb the Rev. Malcolm McColl (not he who was afterwards Canon of Ripon), Mr. McColl having been placed in charge of the parish, with a view to his becoming eventually vicar. Some men and boys who occupied prominent places in the church persisted in reading, in their ordinary conversational manner, but in loud tones, the *Amens* and responses while the same were being sung by the choir.* And the ruffianism was as strong as ever a twelvemonth later, when, the Rev. Henry Aston Walker having been appointed to the vicarage, the parochial girls' school was invaded, at the close of the teaching, on Sunday, January 12, 1879, by a gang of twenty or thirty roughs, headed by Messrs. Fry, Turner, and others. These men then knocked down one of the lady-teachers, came into the boys' school, assaulted Mr. William Collins, the superintendent, took down a picture of the Crucifixion and trampled upon it. And on the following Sunday, which was the first on which Mr. Walker was to officiate in the church after his formal admission to the living, Mr. Sanders asked him to remove the cross and candlesticks from the altar-

* *John Bull*, cited in *Church Times* of Feb. 22, 1878, p. 102.

ledge, and on his refusal went up and removed them himself. The same afternoon the mob assembled before the school-room doors, and the police were sent for, ostensibly to keep order; but those functionaries allowed entrance to the leading rioters, and refused it to the teachers; one of these latter being thus exhorted by a constable:—"Go home, ladies, and say your prayers there."* The object of the Low-Church party in Hatcham was to get the Sunday-school closed.

Sanders was summoned before the Greenwich police-court at the instance of Mr. Walker, who subsequently applied for a summons against Fry. The latter application was refused. And when Mr. Walker's solicitor began to open the case against Sanders, the magistrate, Mr. Balguy, interrupted him, insisting that the matter should be settled privately by arbitration. The case was adjourned; and when it came on again, Mr. Balguy decided that Sanders's acts did not amount to an offence under the statute, Divine Service not having been begun when they were committed.

Nor did the scandalous proceedings cease for a long time. Even in 1882, complaints were made that the music of the responses was disturbed from time to time by persons who persisted in reciting the responses in conversational manner, and in loud tones; and that irreverence, not to say profanity, was shown in a thousand other ways. Opposition visiting, and an opposition Sunday-school, were also commenced, and on the whole

* Letter to the Editor of the *Standard*, signed J. M. B. Also *Church Times* for February 7, 1879.

the Low-Church opponents of Catholicism, not to say of Christianity, might be congratulated by their sympathisers as having done in the parish of St. James's, Hatcham, all which they could be expected to have done.

CHAPTER LXIII.

Immoral Period, continued. Various Minor Prosecutions and Attempts. *The Priest in Absolution*. Society of the Holy Cross. Agitation against both. Its Hypocritical Character. Anti-confessional Memorial.

“You shall see anon: 'tis a knavish piece of work.”—*Hamlet*, Act iii. scene 2.

“Alterius infirma commendatio est quae destructione fulcitur.”—TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 15.

IF we were required to specify any particular year in which the anti-Catholic persecution was at its worst, we should be inclined to name the year 1877. In this year the “Church Association” sent to all its branches copies of a paper to be filled up with information on the following heads:—“Churches in which illegal ceremonies have been introduced:—(1) Diocese; (2) name of parish; (3) name of church; (4) whether consecrated or unconsecrated; (5) name of incumbent; (6) illegal acts and ceremonies introduced into the church, such as vestments, incense, lights, elevation, prostration, mixing water with wine, processions, &c.; (7) When the illegal acts and ceremonies were introduced.

It is, indeed, true that the proceedings initiated against two Ritualistic clergymen had failed.

Thus, a person named Roughton had prosecuted the Rev. Charles Parnell, Incumbent of St. Margaret's, Princes Road, Liverpool, under the Church Discipline Act. St. Margaret's had no parochial district attached to it. The congregation had built their church, and were maintaining its services without extraneous help; so that the promoter (who had never frequented it, and lived in a distant part of the town) had no moral right to interfere. This, however, formed no bar to the "Church Association," at whose instance the prosecution had been got up. But before the case had been carried very far, Mr. Parnell resigned the incumbency on independent grounds, and the "Church Association" offered to stop the prosecution if he would pay their costs. This Mr. Parnell declined to do. Then the Association offered to withdraw on their part, each party paying its own costs; and this proposal Mr. Parnell accepted.* His taxed costs were £151 5s. 8d.† The Rev. Charles Bodington, also, Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Wolverhampton, had been prosecuted by a person of the name of Butcher. Owing, however, to a defect in the process, Lord Penzance found it necessary to dismiss the case, which he did with a distinct expression of regret. On the 26th of October a representation was made to the Archbishop of Canterbury under the Public Worship Regulation Act: the Archbishop in this

* Letter from Mr. Parnell in the *Church Times* of Nov. 26, 1880.

† The receipt by the "Church Association" was acknowledged in the Report presented at the annual meeting of Feb. 25, 1876.

case taking the place of the Bishop of the diocese, because the patronage of the living belonged to the Bishop. The Archbishop, however, refused to sanction the proceedings, suggesting that the complainant should formally call upon the Bishop to exercise his authority for appeasing all diversities; to which authority Mr. Bodington was willing to submit. The "Church Association," however, had taken an independent course—that of teaching the street-boys to cry after the Catholic priests that they would soon have three months.*

Against the Rev. Herbert Gardner, also, Vicar of St. Matthew's, Smethwick, in the Diocese of Lichfield, proceedings were commenced in the August either of this or of the next year. The prosecutor was a Mr. H. T. Fowler, one of the churchwardens. He had already said that there should be no peace as long as Mr. Gardner remained in the parish. The charges were thirteen in number:—(1) Processions, and kneeling or bowing towards the Communion-table and towards the metal cross standing thereon. (2) Standing with back to the people while saying the Lord's Prayer and Collect. (3) Standing with back to the people while saying the Prayer of Consecration. (4) Elevating the paten or bread, and also the cup, to a much greater degree than was necessary. (5) Making the sign of the cross towards the communicants, and not towards himself. (6) Permitting the Rev. E. A. Irons, or other curate, unlawfully to prostrate himself, kneel, or

* Statement by Colonel Bagnall at a meeting of the English Church Union. See *Church Times*, March 2, 1877.

bow towards the cross. (7) Administering to the communicants by putting the cup to their lips, instead of placing it in their hands. (8) Singing the *Agnus Dei*. (9) The ceremony of ablution. (10) Bending the knee, or bowing towards the Communion-table, and towards the metal cross on the Communion-table. (11) The curate's unlawfully serving and elevating the bread and wine. [What was meant by "unlawfully serving" does not appear.] (12) Unlawfully elevating the offertory-alsms. (13) The interpolation of the words "on the anniversary of the English Church Union" when giving notice of the celebration of the Holy Communion.

The Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Selwyn) allowed proceedings to be taken. Some flaws, however, in the documents of the prosecution caused the case to fall through. The complainant made another attempt against Mr. Gardner, but the Bishop was willing that the proceedings should be delayed, and in the course of the delay he departed this life. About the same time the complainant's representation was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury; but he insisted on leaving it to be dealt with by Bishop Selwyn's successor.

When Dr. Maclagan came to the see, he requested Mr. Gardner to cease making the sign of the cross when administering the consecrated elements, but would not support the complainant any further; and the latter found it useless to attempt raising any more opposition.*

In another case, however, on application being made to Bishop Selwyn by three parishioners against

* This I have by private information kindly furnished.

the Rev. Edward Glover, Vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton, on account of the eastward position, the mixed chalice, altar-lights, and coloured stoles, the Bishop refused to allow a prosecution.

An attempt was made by the Rev. John Sidney Adolphus Vatcher, Senior Curate and Evening Lecturer of St. George's-in-the-East, to get up a prosecution, in connexion with the "Church Association," against the Rev. Charles Lowder, Vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks. This, however, was not only without the consent of his Rector, but in direct opposition to the Rector's views, which were in favour of letting his brother-clergy alone; and it also came to nought.

An attempt was made also to get up a prosecution against the Rev. Thomas Thellusson Carter, Rector of Clewer, in the Diocese of Oxford, and Honorary Canon of Christ Church. Three persons (one of them named Bulkeley) were found willing to profess themselves aggrieved parishioners; and they were duly provided with a formal guarantee that the "Church Association" would provide their costs in the suit. This last paper they in their simplicity sent to the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness) along with their complaint against Mr. Carter, but were straightway informed by the Bishop that the "Church Association" had, by furnishing such a guarantee, become guilty of the offence termed by lawyers "maintenance," and which is defined to be an officious intermeddling in a suit by assisting either party with money or otherwise; and their attempt therefore fell to the ground. We shall see hereafter how a similar attempt was made

subsequently, and met with more success, though not exactly in the manner which had been contemplated.

In this same year (1877) occasion was found for another set attack upon Catholic belief and practice, independent of the attacks on Catholic ritual. It had always been held in the Church of England that our Lord Jesus Christ left authority in His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him ; and that in consequence of this every priest may, on receiving a confession of sin, minister the forgiveness of the same from the Lord : so that when, in the fulfilment of his office, he says to anyone, "I absolve thee," the person so addressed, being a penitent believer, is forgiven then and there by the Lord ; Who, being Himself in heaven, performs the act of forgiveness by His priest upon earth, the priest having, when he was ordained, received the Spirit of Christ for this purpose. This truth, like others, had been very much neglected before the time of the Catholic revival. Attention, however, had been called to it in the *Tracts for the Times*, and various members of the Church of England, who believed what they read in their Prayer-books, set themselves to act upon it in their practice : penitents setting themselves to make confession of their sins, and priests setting themselves to minister absolution according to what they believed to be the mind of the Anglican Church.

One of these priests was the Rev. John Chambers, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Crown Street, Soho. He composed a work to which we have already alluded, and which he entitled *The Priest in Absolution* ; and

for the composition of which he was qualified not only by deep personal piety, but also by great knowledge of human nature, and large experience in receiving confessions. He would not, however, publish his work; preferring that it should have circulation only among those who would put it to a proper use. In 1875 he departed to his rest, his death having been hastened, if not caused, by his hard ministerial work; and the book which he had composed was then offered by his executors to a Society called the Society of the Holy Cross; the members of that Society being the parties most likely to carry out Mr. Chambers's wishes with regard to the circulation of the work.

The work contained, among other advice, recommendations as to the questioning of penitents by the priest. No doubt, if the penitent has been properly instructed, and is coming to the ordinance of absolution in a right spirit, no such questioning is necessary; he will confess all which he needs to confess, that is, all which he ought to confess, and will do so in the matter both of generals and of details. If, however, a Church were introducing for the first time among its members the use of private confession, the question would arise, On whom should rest the responsibility of getting the confession made with sufficient fulness? on the penitent or on the priest? The Western Church had ruled that the priest should bear some part of the responsibility; and that he was to discharge his duty by questioning the penitent as far as he might deem necessary. And on that principle Mr. Chambers had proceeded

in the counsels which he gave to priests using his book. He specified certain questions which, or the like of which, it might be necessary to put to a penitent in certain particular cases ; but appended to one of his chapters the following note :—“ It is scarcely needful to observe that the main object in entering upon this subject of spiritual pathology, is to aid the priest to avoid needless and dangerous inquiries, and at the same time not to omit probing the wounds of sin when necessary for the patient’s entire cure, often not only of soul, but also of body.” * Another chapter, “ Concerning the Mode of Questioning Penitents,” commenced thus :—“ We have said already that the priest cannot be too careful, in questions about sin, to avoid giving the penitent thereby any further acquaintance with evil. Yet, at the same time, we must often supply the want of knowledge on the part of the penitent, lest through ignorance a part of the confession be kept back which is the most necessary to be unfolded. Not to be impatient, and not to travel too fast, is the great secret of avoiding great indiscretions.” Meanwhile “ *the priest must be careful also not to be too reserved in questions lest he risk thereby the loss of a great good for the sake of a less.* It is easy for an adroit priest to ask questions, especially upon the subject of purity, so as not to be under-

* Page 21 (footnote to the chapter on Impurity, as one of the Seven Capital Sins). This and the following citations are taken at second-hand from “ *The Priest in Absolution* ” and the *Society of the Holy Cross. A Correspondence between “ A London Priest ” and A. H. Mackonochie, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Alban the Martyr, Holborn.* Reprinted, with considerable additions, from the “ *Daily Express.* ”

stood by anyone except such as is guilty of what is supposed. If a child confess ‘bad thoughts,’ it may be asked, ‘What sort of thoughts?’ for in children they are often confined to anger and revenge. Children should always be exhorted to remember that they are always in the presence of God, and that they should never do what they would be ashamed of their parents seeing.”* And in advising the priest as to his manner of dealing with children, and specifying certain questions which might be necessary in particular cases, Mr. Chambers proceeded—“But such questions as these should be put in the most guarded manner, and only when there is good reason to fear that the child has been exposed to temptations of this sort. It is better that a confession should be materially wanting in fulness, than that a child should learn or imbibe a desire to know what hitherto had been hid from its understanding.”†

The book consisted of two parts. Part I., containing 91 pages, with three pages and a half of “Advertisement to the Reader,” treated of the priest’s inner life, in reference to the work of hearing confessions and ministering to the penitent’s reformation in holiness. Part II., containing 322 pages, with three more pages of “Advertisement,” consisted almost wholly of instructions as to the nature of various acts in reference to sin: “just as a medical book would deal with certain states of body in relation to disease.” And it was

* Pages 80, 81, cited in the *Correspondence* just named, pp. 29, 30. Why we print certain words in italics will be seen further on.

† Page 144, cited in the same *Correspondence*, p. 31.

described by a layman, strong both in body and in mind, as “ a perfectly chaste book.”*

So much for the character of the book entitled *The Priest in Absolution*. Now about the SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CROSS, to which the copyright had been given. It was formed in or about 1855, primarily for the purpose of deepening the spiritual life in the members by means of a definite rule. The members of the Society were bishops, priests, deacons, and *bonâ fide* candidates for Holy Orders ; and were divided into Probationers (whose period of probation was one year) and Brethren ; the latter (who were all in the priesthood) being the governing body. All the members were committed to one rule at least, called the Green Rule. There were two other rules, to be embraced at option : one of these was restricted to celibates. The Green Rule included various minor rules, such as the rising from bed not later than half-past seven in the morning : the celebrating, if possible, on all Sundays and festivals : the communicating in all cases fasting : the making sacramental confession at least once a year, and as often as conscience might require : the reading devotionally a portion of Scripture every day : and the making a retreat every year. And a standard of daily life, specifying particulars as to food, dress, recreation, study, and society, was recommended to those Brethren who followed this rule.

Besides the inner work done by the members of the Society of the Holy Cross in the observance of the Society's rules, the Society proposed to do

* See the above-cited *Correspondence*, p. 5.

work of an external character, including mission-work at home and abroad—the issuing of tracts and other publications—and common action in matters affecting the interests of the Church. And the Brethren were pledged to aid each other both in spiritual and in temporal matters.

Such was the Society into whose possession the copyright of *The Priest in Absolution* had come. Being a society for the increase of personal piety, it naturally abstained from publicity. But on the occasion of the Church Congress at Wolverhampton in 1867 it came before the public, distributing publicly a printed statement of its nature and objects, and making itself known in other ways as well.

It appears that by some means or other one or more copies of *The Priest in Absolution* had come into the hands of certain members of the “Church Association.” Several of the bishops had become acquainted with the existence of the book, and one at least had certainly been giving close attention to it for several weeks : * when, on the night of the 14th of June, 1877, Lord Redesdale drew attention in the House of Lords both to the book and to the Society of the Holy Cross, naming in his speech fifteen priests members of the Society. The noble Lord did, at the same time, his best to hold up both the book and the Society to public execration : representing the book as published, when the very title-page declared that it was not ; reading garbled extracts from the book, the con-

* See the above-cited *Correspondence*, p. 5.

text of which extracts was alone sufficient to refute entirely the character which, on the strength of the garbling, his Lordship sought to fasten on the Society and its members;* and keeping out of sight the fact that the strongest passages against which objection might be thought to lie were extracts from so generally approved a divine as Bishop Jeremy Taylor. He also spoke of *The Priest's Prayer-book* (fifth edition), in which were directions for communicating a sick person of the reserved Sacrament, and thought that there should be a decided condemnation of the practices indicated or recommended in the two works.

The reader will ask, perhaps, how Lord Redesdale obtained access to *The Priest in Absolution*, that work being printed but not published. Two answers were given at the time. According to Mr. Collette, Secretary of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, a person went into the study of a clergyman, saw the book on the table, and took it away. And it is remarkable that Mr. Collette, in giving this account, did not give the slightest intimation that he regarded the act of theft as being at all morally wrong; nor, indeed, did such an idea seem to be entertained by more than a few Low-Churchmen, if, indeed, it was entertained by any. As a Low-Church clergyman once admitted to the writer that there were limitations to the law of charity—in other words, that Christians are not always bound to love their neighbour as themselves—so Mr. Collette and his friends seem to

* One of the passages quoted by Lord Redesdale apart from the context is given above, in italics.

have taken for granted that there were limitations to the law of common honesty. On the other hand, a Major Wetheral denied Mr. Collette's statement, and said that he was the one who gave the book to Lord Redesdale. His account was, "It was lent to me about two months ago by Mr. Fleming of Half-Moon Street, whose name is boldly printed on the cover, and in whose possession it has been, I am informed, for three years, and most certainly was not procured by him in the surreptitious and dishonest manner implied in Mr. Collette's letter." *

Be this, however, as it may, when the noble Lord had spoken, the Archbishop of Canterbury thanked him for bringing the subject forward. As to *The Priest in Absolution*, it was, he said, a disgrace to the community that such a book should be circulated under the authority of clergymen of the Established Church. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott) said that when a clergyman connected with the Society of the Holy Cross was about to enter his diocese through the resignation of another clergyman, and it was in his power to refuse accepting the resignation of the latter, he did refuse, and required the former clergyman to sign a paper notifying his withdrawal from the Society, and his repudiation of the *The Priest in Absolution*; which paper, said the Bishop, was signed.

In the House of Commons, on the 21st of June, Mr. J. Cowen asked the Home Secretary (the Right Hon. R. A. Cross) if his attention had been

* *Church Times* for August 10, 1877.

directed to a book recently published, entitled *The Priest in Absolution*; if he was aware that the book was substantially the same as one for the circulation of which a lecturer against auricular confession had been not long before imprisoned; if he was aware that *The Priest in Absolution* was printed with the sanction and for the use of the "Master, Vicars, and Brethren of the Society of the Holy Cross," of which there were seven hundred members, chiefly clergymen of the Church of England; and if he was prepared to take steps for testing the legality of the publication. Mr. Forsyth asked the Attorney-General (Sir J. Holker) whether his attention had been directed to the distribution of a book called *The Priest in Absolution* by certain clergymen of the Church of England, and whether he had considered the propriety of instituting a prosecution following the example of the prosecution then pending against the publishers of a book called *The Fruits of Philosophy*. The Attorney-General answered both questions together. His attention had been drawn to the book, but he had no special means of obtaining information on the subject; nor was he aware whether the facts [he probably meant the allegations] could be substantiated or not. The Government had nothing to do with the prosecution of *The Fruits of Philosophy*. Nor was there any reason why proceedings should be taken in this case of *The Priest in Absolution*, that book not being circulated among the laity. If, however, it were so circulated, the circulators ought to be prosecuted for publishing an "obscene and disgusting book."

This was the beginning of the agitation against *The Priest in Absolution* and the Society of the Holy Cross. And for weeks—we might almost say for months—the air was full of invectives against both book and Society. And thus was the attempt made to raise a new storm of persecution against some of the most exemplary clergy of the Church of England. The attempt had a certain amount of success. Church-Associationists and those who sympathised with them made the platform ring with denunciations of clergy who belonged to the Society of the Holy Cross. One country newspaper published a list of clergy in one neighbourhood who were supposed to belong to it. The visiting Justices who ruled over the Clerkenwell House of Detention, and had lately renewed a licence for the notorious Argyll Rooms, had the impertinence to pass a resolution reflecting by implication on their excellent chaplain, the Rev. John William Horsley, for the sole offence of belonging to the obnoxious Society; * insomuch that that gentleman, deeming discretion to be the better part of valour, resigned his membership. The trustees of Betton's Charity resolved to withdraw their grants from all schools under the superintendence or management of clergymen who were members either of the Society of the Holy Cross, or of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament; and had the impertinence to question clergymen on these private matters. †

* The resolution (which was passed almost unanimously) was "That the ministrations of a clergyman who should be a member of the Holy Cross Society would be calculated to further deprave the inmates of the Clerkenwell Jail."

† See the *Church Times* for December 14, 1887, p. 706; also for December 21, p. 720.

One clergyman, eager to save his own popularity, thought it necessary, in contradicting the statement that he was himself a member, to say that he looked upon it as the foulest libel which could be published about an English clergyman. Those members of the Society who were candidates for Holy Orders soon perceived that their chances of ordination would be diminished, if not destroyed, and those who were curates came to a like conclusion with regard to their chances of promotion, to say nothing of the possibility of their being dismissed at the earliest notice. In short, the Society soon found it desirable to refuse membership for the future to all persons who were not already both in Holy Orders and beneficed.

The hypocrisy connected with this agitation will be sufficiently perceived when it is noted that the members of the "Church Association" had sometimes allowed *The Confessional Unmasked* to be publicly exposed for sale at lectures given under their auspices. This at least had been done at a lecture given at the Horns Assembly Rooms, Kennington, by a clergyman of the name of Coote, November 28, 1867. At the door of the room was a man behind a table, with copies of the above-named work, and other books of a like character, and soliciting everyone on passing out of the room to buy. The only bishop, however, who appears to have characterised the agitation as hypocritical was the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness).

The agitation continued, and culminated in a petition to the Queen, which was got up by the "Church Association," and of which we must now

speak. We have already seen how the dishonesty of the Low-Church party with respect to the Prayer-book had been evidenced from the first beginnings of the party. We have seen, too, how their tactics had been twofold; one section of the party professing to be satisfied with the Prayer-book as it was, pretending great regard for its rules and injunctions, and prosecuting Ritualistic clergymen on charges of violating them; while another section proclaimed aloud that the Prayer-book needed revising in a Protestant direction, and strove from time to time to get such revision effected by Parliament. This year (1877) the former section adopted the tactics of the latter section. The Prayer-book contemplates in the clearest terms the existence of the confessional as one of the Church's recognised institutions—an institution whereof two classes of persons in particular were to be specially moved to have recourse to it: sick persons with burdened consciences, and all persons preparing for Holy Communion, whose private self-examination and secret penitence did not suffice to make them feel at ease with themselves. Presuming, however, on the carelessness with which the general run of Low-Church people read their Prayer-books, the "Church Association" now got up a memorial to the Queen "praying her Majesty to use all the influence at her command to repress the practice of auricular confession."

This petition purported to proceed from members of the Church of England. It will be remembered, too, that the Association which got it up professed to exist for the purpose of upholding the doctrine

and principles of the same Church. Here, then, were members of the Church of England pledging themselves to uphold the Church's doctrine and principles, and yet seeking that one distinctly declared doctrine of the same Church should be practically contradicted, and those who acted upon that doctrine in their practice discouraged in every possible way. The petition was signed by more than one person who had special private reasons for disapproving of the practice of confession. For the Duke of Sutherland, one of those who signed it, had presided at a dinner given in honour of a "gentleman" who had been dismissed from the Queen's Army for attempting to seduce a young lady in a railway-carriage, and another person whose name appeared among the signatures had been condemned to pay costs as co-respondent in a divorce-suit. The manner, too, in which signatures were obtained did not speak for the views of the promoters as to truthfulness. Many persons were allowed to sign who were *bonâ fide* Dissenters.* Some were induced to sign who had no interest in the subject-matter.† One, an admirer of Charles Bradlaugh, the atheist, said, "I signed but I did not read it, and do not know what it is for. I would sign anything to do away with religion, or what they call religion."‡ Another said that he hated the Church of England, and would like to pull it down.§ One person acknowledged having

* *Church Times* for 1877, September 28, p. 537; November 16, p. 640; November 23, p. 656; November 30, p. 672.

† *Ib.* September 28, p. 537.

‡ *Ib.* December 7, p. 689.

§ *Ib.*

been asked six or eight times to sign, and having signed each time.* Some children were told that they could sign for their fathers or mothers, and did so.† The signatures of Sunday School children were accepted.‡ In more than one case, copies of the memorial were taken to public-houses and meeting-houses.§ One signature was that of a prostitute.|| The total number of signatures was 400,702. But, nevertheless, Lord Orammore afterwards complained bitterly, at a meeting of the Protestant Reformation Society, that only a hundred peers and as many members of the House of Commons had signed. And it was, perhaps, as much from the knowledge coming abroad of how some signatures had been obtained as from anything else that (as Mr. Andrews, Chairman of the "Church Association" acknowledged at the autumn Conference in 1880) no result at all had followed on the presentation of the memorial.

* *Church Times* for 1877, November 9, p. 628.

† *Ib.* December 14, p. 706.

‡ *Ib.* November 23, p. 656.

§ *Ib.* also December 28, p. 732.

|| *Ib.*

CHAPTER LXIV.

Immoral Period, continued. Low-Church Conduct at the Croydon Church Congress. Low-Church Secessions. Conference of High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen at Lambeth. Low-Church Withdrawals from the S. P. C. K. Proceedings against Mr. Edwards. Profane Mob in his Church. Bishop Jackson and the Holy Cross Society. Further Proceedings against Mr. Mackonochie. Lord Penzance and Sir Alexander Cockburn. Memorial against Cuddesdon College. Third Suit against Mr. Mackonochie. Wycliffe and Ridley Halls.

“KING. My Lord Chief Justice, speak to that vain man.

CH. J. Have you your wits? know you what 'tis you speak?”

King Henry IV., Second Part, Act v., Scene 4.

THE Church Congress was held in the year 1877 at Croydon, in Surrey, and was attended by many Low-Churchmen, although urged very strongly by some of their Low-Church brethren to stay away. The Earl of Harrowby and some other Low-Churchmen then endeavoured, at the hazard of a riot, to fix a factitious unpopularity upon the Ritualists; and an attempt was also made to oust members of the Society of the Holy Cross in particular from taking any prominent part in the proceedings. Both attempts, however, failed.

We have already remarked* upon the secession of Dr. Gregg. The Rev. Capel Molyneux, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, resigned his benefice in the first half of this year, on the ground that he could not conscientiously make those subscriptions which, in accordance with the law, he had made previously to entering upon his

* See above, p. 328.

benefice; and his example was followed in the April of the following year (1878) by another Low-Church clergyman, the Rev. Charles Tamberlane Astley, Vicar of Gillingham, near Chatham. His stumbling-blocks were the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration and Priestly Absolution as taught in the Prayer-book. Would that the Rev. Rowley Hill, Vicar of Sheffield, and a member of the "Church Association," had been content to follow the examples of those gentlemen! or rather, to have abstained altogether from taking orders in the Church of England! Instead of doing so, however, he allowed himself to be consecrated, on the nomination of the Earl of Beaconsfield, to the See of Sodor and Man.

In the December of this year (1877) the Archbishop of Canterbury invited representative men of both High-Church and Low-Church parties to meet at Lambeth and discuss the possibility of union amongst Churchpeople. On which the *Rock* remarked: "We are told that Friday's gathering was the second of its kind—the first having been held at Lambeth in August last. But if so, how came the Evangelical clergy there? In society, people who have any regard for their reputation would scarcely accept a second invitation to a house where on a previous occasion they had met Dr. Gully and Mrs. Bravo. Are God's people to be less careful of their character than men of the world? If not, how came it to pass that after being once asked to meet law-breakers, traitors, blasphemers, and idolaters, our Ryles, Cadmans, Garbetts, Auriols, &c., should be ready to do so a

second time? . . . Do our friends believe that their attendance at the Holy Communion in such strange companionship would be an act well-pleasing to Almighty God? Are ministers who would rather die than surrender the Protestant view of the Lord's Supper to kneel side by side with cannibal 'priests' who first worship and then devour the God whom they pretend they have made?"

To do deserved credit, however, to the ultra-members of the Low-Church party, Ritualists were not the only *bêtes noires* of their estimation. In this same December the Earl of Shaftesbury withdrew his name from the lists of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on the ground that a little work by Mr. Brownlow Maitland, and published by the Society, on *The Argument from Prophecy*, was neologian. Mr. Brownlow Maitland had, it seems, given up certain special passages from the class of admitted prophecies, for argument's sake, and with a view to occupying a common ground with his adversaries. Dean Close and Canon Miller (the Vicar of Greenwich) followed the noble Lord's example, and Dean Law, Canon Garbett, the *Record*, and other parties joined in the outcry against the Society.

We must now, however, cast our eyes back a month or two, in order to see what had been done in the case of Mr. Edwards, the Vicar of Prestbury. He was cited in due course to appear before Lord Penzance; who, on the 17th of July, 1877, gave judgment, sitting in the library of Lambeth Palace. The points complained of had been, in one way or

another, reduced to two, viz. the having a crucifix over the altar, and the wearing Eucharistic vestments. The suit with regard to the crucifix was dismissed, on the ground that the promoters might, if they thought fit, apply for a faculty to have the crucifix removed. As to the vestments, Mr. Edwards's defence was that the Ridsdale Judgment had turned upon an error in fact, the Judicial Committee having assumed the obligatory force of the Advertisements of Archbishop Parker, whereas no proof had been given either that Queen Elizabeth authorised them, or (if she had done so, which subsequent research showed that she had not) that the document cited as the Advertisements was the same as was alleged to have been authorised. To this, however, Lord Penzance refused to listen, saying that if he allowed the controversy to be opened again, the law would be liable to vary if "any new or additional historical facts should be disinterred from the lumber of the past," and he pronounced Mr. Edwards guilty of illegal conduct in wearing the Eucharistic vestments, and ordered him to cease from wearing them. Each side had to pay its own costs. From this judgment Mr. Edwards appealed to the Queen in Council.

On the 3rd of November, 1877, he was ordered by Lord Penzance to file a declaration within a month promising that he would comply with Lord Penzance's order; which Mr. Edwards did not do. On the 5th of January, 1878, Mr. Moore, the proctor for Mr. Combe—that is, for the "Church Association"—submitted that as Mr. Edwards had not complied with Lord Penzance's first order, but

had appealed to the Queen in Council, he should now be served with a notice, so that ground might be afforded for applying to have a definitive sentence pronounced. Lord Penzance heard arguments in favour of Mr. Moore's point on the 10th, but deferred his judgment. On the 9th of March his Lordship, sitting at Lambeth Palace, gave judgment. He denied that any new and independent court had been created by the Public Worship Regulation Act, and justified himself for sitting at Lambeth. And with regard to the case then before him, he pronounced that on the 17th of the previous July Mr. Edwards had been proved guilty of certain departures from the authorised ceremonials of the Church. He required an affidavit to be filed showing that since the decree then pronounced Mr. Edwards had not discontinued the practices in question; and when that affidavit had been filed he would suspend Mr. Edwards for six months. Mr. Edwards was to pay the costs of these proceedings. On the 23rd of March, accordingly, an affidavit was brought, signed by Combe the promoter, and another person named Wheeler; and Lord Penzance thereupon sentenced Mr. Edwards to be suspended for six months from Sunday, the 31st, and to pay the costs. This sentence was served on Mr. Edwards on that same Sunday, being affixed to the door of Prestbury Church.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol sent a clergyman named Lyne to do Mr. Edwards's duty. Mr. Edwards, however, insisted on doing it himself, on the ground that Lord Penzance, having no

spiritual jurisdiction, could not canonically suspend him, and Mr. Lyne was sent, with all civility, about his business.

The terms of Mr. Combe's affidavit, on which the court proceeded, were, we suppose, not such as English courts had ever before consented to receive. They ran thus: "I, the said Charles Combe, for myself say that I have not been in the habit of attending Divine Service in the said parish church of Prestbury for some years past, and *I cannot therefore state of my own knowledge* whether the practices above mentioned have been of constant occurrence there, but *I have been informed* by several persons who have regularly attended Divine Service in the said church that all such practices have been usual in the said church, but such persons are adherents of the said Rev. John Edwards the younger, and will not give evidence voluntarily against him in this case."

In the ensuing week, however, a new move was made by Mr. Edwards's enemies, the result of which Mr. Edwards himself shall relate, as he related it in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury:—"It was on Passion Sunday morning, the second Sunday of my suspension, in 1878, that, without the slightest warning, we found our ordinary devout and quiet congregation supplemented by an evidently organised band of strange, rough men, who filled every vacant place, and thronged the aisles of the church. On ascending the pulpit to preach, at the conclusion of the Nicene Creed, I found myself confronted by a perfect sea of strange, forbidding faces, mingled with, or hemming in, in

strongest contrast with them, the dear familiar ones. I had not gone on far with my sermon, when suddenly there broke forth, in horrid and evident concert, a loud, sustained shout from many throats. And then, as suddenly, all was still. Thankful am I to Him Who sustained me in that trying hour that neither courage nor self-possession for one moment forsook me. When silence was restored, I spoke to them solemnly of Death, Judgment, and the Life to come. They listened with marked attention, and, the sermon ended, the Holy Service proceeded without further interruption to its close. No little indignation, as may be supposed, was aroused in the parish, and no little curiosity excited as to the cause and objects of this profane and unseemly demonstration. ‘Who were they? Whence did they come? Why did they come? What good did they get by coming? Who sent them? who paid them?’ were questions freely and often asked; but only Echo answered. It remains to this day a dark and dreadful mystery.”*

On the 11th of May, Dr. Deane, on the part of the prosecution, moved Lord Penzance to order that the sentence of suspension previously issued should be enforced, that such further steps should be taken as justice might require, and that Mr. Edwards should be condemned in the costs of these proceedings. On this occasion he stated that Mr. Edwards, in refusing to allow the Rev. Charles Richard Nunez Lyne to minister in his stead, had

* *St. Mary's, Prestbury. The Prosecution. . . .* By John Baghot de la Bere, M.A. (formerly Edwards), 2nd edition, London, 1881, pp. 30, 31.

used language of shocking profanity. Those who remember what Mr. Edwards's antecedents had been will probably think that Dr. Deane's ideas of profanity differed from the ideas entertained by ordinary people. What Mr. Edwards said was, "This church is not without a pastor, and I am determined to resist any intrusion into my church, and I will undertake to conduct the services myself, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." * Lord Penzance ordered that Mr. Edwards's disobedience should be signified to the Court of Chancery forthwith; and condemned Mr. Edwards in costs. This was to enable Mr. Edwards's enemies to get him imprisoned; a step, however, which those wicked men dared not take. The decree of the court was not to be drawn up until a supplementary affidavit had been brought into the registry stating how the notice of the court's motion had been served on the defendant. But in point of fact no application was made for the writ of *significavit* until after the legal limit of ten days had elapsed.

Early in this year (1878) the Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson) refused not only not to license any actual member of the Society of the Holy Cross, but even to allow any exchange when one of the parties was, or had lately been, connected with that Society. † The prosecution of Mr. Mackonochie was still going on, as we have now to see.

On the 18th of March Mr. Mackonochie was served with a citation to appear before Lord Pen-

* *Church Times*, April 5, 1878, p. 192.

† *Ib.* for February 1, 1878.

zance, but did not do so. And on the 23rd Dr. Stephens, on the part of the nominal prosecutor, Mr. Martin, applied to the court to enforce the monition issued in June 1875 by Sir Robert Phillimore, then Dean of Arches; Mr. Mackonochie having, it was said, disobeyed that monition in four respects: by wearing the Eucharistic vestments, by singing the *Agnus Dei* after the consecration of the elements and before the Communion, by signing the cross towards the congregation at various times, and by kissing the service-book. Lord Penzance, however, ordered another monition to be issued, and that Mr. Mackonochie should pay the costs of this application. It may be noted that the five persons on whose affidavits the monition was granted were so far from being aggrieved parishioners, or indeed from being parishioners at all, that they resided in the three districts of St. James's, Tufnell Park, and Hammersmith.* On the 29th the second monition was served as ordered upon Mr. Mackonochie, warning him to abstain from the practices specified in the previous one. Mr. Mackonochie received also a further notice citing him to appear before Lord Penzance on the 11th of May; but as he again failed to appear, application was made by Dr. Stephens on the part of Mr. Martin for the enforcement of certain monitions already issued by Lord Penzance against him, for further order to be taken by the court according to the requirements of justice, and for the condemnation of Mr. Mackonochie in the costs of these proceedings. Lord Penzance said that the court

* *Church Times*, March 29, 1878.

would consider what course to take, and on the 1st of June passed upon Mr. Mackonochie a sentence of suspension *ab officio et beneficio* for three years, and condemned him in costs. On the following Sunday morning it was noticed that one of the Lessons for the day had in it the following passage: "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father nor Me." Mr. Mackonochie took no notice of the sentence; and a few days later he applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a rule of prohibition against Lord Penzance, on the ground that whereas the invariable punishment for contempt of court was fine or imprisonment, and such punishment could only be imposed by the civil courts, Lord Penzance had not adopted that mode. The case was argued on the 27th and 28th of June, before the Lord Chief Justice (Sir Alexander Cockburn), Mr. Justice Mellor, and Mr. Justice Lush, and judgment was given on the 8th of August. It was decided (Mr. Justice Lush dissenting) that Lord Penzance had gone beyond the limits of his power; that Mr. Mackonochie's suspension was both irregular and inoperative; and that the rule must therefore be made absolute.

Reverting now to the case of Mr. Baghot de la Bere, formerly Edwards, we have to narrate that on the 12th of June Lord Penzance sat again in Lambeth Palace Library, and was moved as on the last occasion. He declined, however, to comply with the motion. He would, he said, have been prepared

to order the issue of a *significavit*, the result of which would have been Mr. Edwards's imprisonment. But owing to the action of the Court of Queen's Bench in the case of "a gentleman named Mackonochie," he thought it his duty to forbear from taking any further steps at present, although satisfied in his own mind that his decree suspending Mr. Edwards was valid. On the 2nd of November, however, Lord Penzance sitting again at Lambeth, gave judgment; and took the opportunity of criticising the judgment which the Lord Chief Justice had delivered on the 8th of August, as noticed before; pronouncing it to be "based upon serious misconceptions of fact and equally grave misinterpretations of the law;" and proceeding thereupon to argue in support of his own position. On account, however, of the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, he declined to proceed to compulsory measures against Mr. Baghot de la Bere for the present.

Sir Alexander Cockburn was roused by Lord Penzance's attack to reply to the noble Lord; and he did reply in a letter to the offender, dated the 10th of December, of which letter Lord Penzance, after (we presume) having read a few sentences, deemed it best to leave the greater part unread; on the same principle on which Sir Joshua Reynolds, when in conversation a remark was made at which he might have been expected to take offence, and to which, therefore, he was willing to be deaf,

"Shifted his trumpet, and only took snuff."

And the noble Lord had reason; for after the Lord

Chief Justice had noticed the "offensive and unprovoked attack" upon himself, and how his arguments had been "systematically perverted and misrepresented for the purpose of appearing to refute them, as also, it would seem, for the ungenerous purpose of holding" him "up to contempt and ridicule," and after he had remarked on Lord Penzance's judgment as "the first instance in our judicial annals in which a judge whose decision has been overruled on appeal or arrested by prohibition, instead of abiding the decision of a superior appellate tribunal, has, on a similar case presenting itself, availed himself of the opportunity to rail at the judgment which has superseded his own," and as "the first instance of a difference of judicial opinion being made the occasion of a personal and hostile attack,"—Sir Alexander proceeded to say, "I readily agree that no man can be better qualified than your Lordship to speak as to the inconvenience and embarrassment of having to administer a law with which one is not familiar. Having been brought up to Common Law, and never having practised in the ecclesiastical courts, your Lordship took upon yourself the office of an ecclesiastical judge; and I dare say thus acquired practical experience of the difficulty which most people would labour under in such a position."*

Against the writ of prohibition granted by the Court of Queen's Bench against Lord Penzance two appeals were lodged: one on behalf of Mr. Martin,

* *A Letter to . . . Lord Penzance . . . on his Judgment in the Case of Combe v. Edwards.* By the Lord Chief Justice. London, 1878, p. 27.

and the other on behalf of Lord Penzance ; and on March 10, 1879, the Court of Appeal, consisting of Lord Coleridge and Lords Justices James, Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger, sat to hear them. The arguments lasted several days, and were not concluded until the 19th. Judgment was given on the 28th of June, reversing the judgment of the Queen's Bench. After some further delay, it was announced that no costs were to be given on either side of the cause in the Queen's Bench Division ; the appellants, however, were to have their costs of appeal. Meanwhile Mr. Mackonochie had held on his course without troubling himself about Lord Penzance or anybody else ; but on the 15th of November, 1879, Lord Penzance decreed that the sentence of three years' suspension should take effect from Sunday, the 23rd ; and on that day the sentence was duly served on Mr. Mackonochie ; who, however, went through the day's duties notwithstanding.

It may be noticed here that a memorial got up in the year 1878 against the Theological College at Cuddesdon was signed by only 450 churchwardens out of more than 1,300.

On the 17th of January, 1880, the "Church Association," using Mr. Martin's name, commenced a third suit against the Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, praying for his deprivation ; this course being deemed, in the interests of the Association, more suitable than getting Lord Penzance's sentence of suspension enforced by imprisonment. Mr. Jeune, the counsel for the prosecution, stated that the object of the present suit was not to enforce sus-

pension, but to punish for contempt. And if he could have been compelled to state, further, why the promoters had this latter object in view rather than the former, he would probably have had to say that while the general public would probably acquiesce in Mr. Mackonochie's deprivation, his imprisonment would cause such an outcry throughout the Church of England as the "Church Association" would not desire to encounter.

Lord Penzance did not like the prospect of a new suit; but he allowed the citation in the new suit to be issued. On the 6th of March, sitting in the library of Lambeth Palace, he was asked to admit twenty-four articles which had been filed by the promoter against Mr. Mackonochie; and which, said Mr. Jeune, concluded with what was not very usual, viz. a prayer. This, the learned counsel afterwards explained, was a prayer for Mr. Mackonochie's deprivation. With the omission of the twenty-first article, charging the defendant with taking the eastward position, and some re-numbering, and likewise some verbal alterations, Lord Penzance saw no ground of objection in the articles, and ordered their admission.

On the 6th of April, however, notice was given of an appeal to the House of Lords on behalf of Mr. Mackonochie; and notice of the same was duly served on Lord Penzance and Mr. Martin. On the 8th of April, Lord Penzance, sitting in the library of Lambeth Palace, commenced hearing the new suit: and this time the suit was not under the Public Worship Regulation Act, but under the earlier Church Discipline Act. On this occasion

the evidence of two spies was taken : the spies being W. G. Bunn of Hammersmith, and F. E. Jones of Maida Vale. And on the 5th of June, Lord Penzance decreed that the articles admitted had been proved, but forbore to pronounce that Mr. Mackonochie had offended against the laws ecclesiastical, or to punish him in any way save condemning him in costs. Against this judgment notice of appeal to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council was entered in Mr. Martin's name. But on the 14th of the same month Mr. Martin wrote to the Bishop of London disclaiming all intention of appealing against Lord Penzance's judgment. In April 1881 the House of Lords confirmed the decision of the Court of Appeal in the earlier suit, and concerning which the notice had been given some twelve months before.

In February 1882 Mr. Martin's appeal to the Judicial Committee was heard before the Lord Chancellor (Lord Selborne), Lord Spencer, the Archbishop of York, Lord Blackburn, Lord Watson, Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir James Hannen, and Sir Robert Collier ; the Bishops of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot), Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne), and Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan) being present as ecclesiastical assessors. Judgment was given the same day : Lord Penzance's judgment was to be reversed, and the case remitted again to him.

On the 17th of April an official statement was made, and appeared in print, that no further proceedings had been taken. We shall see hereafter how the case ended.

This will be the most convenient place for men-

tioning the establishment of two Low-Church halls—one at Oxford, and the other at Cambridge. The former, Wycliffe Hall, was commenced at the end of 1877, as a Low-Church institution of the best character; *i.e.* inculcating an exact and devotional study of the Bible as a whole, coupled with a personal use of God's grace, but not seeking to enforce Low-Church opinions in any way.* The object of its promoters was to meet the requirements of persons looking forward to Holy Orders, and who, having taken University degrees, wished to continue their studies at Oxford. The governing body was a council, formed at a preliminary meeting of persons interested in the scheme; and included at its formation, or soon after, at least four persons who were or had been members of the "Church Association." It filled up vacancies in its own body as vacancies arose. No authorities in the Church or diocese were *ex officio* members of it. The course of instruction included, as its leading features, Biblical theology, based on a comprehensive study of the Old and New Testaments, Christian evidences, and exercises in reading and preaching. The requirements of candidates for theological honours, and of such as wished to pass the preliminary examination for Holy Orders, were also borne in mind. A shortened service

* "If the word" [party] "is used as implying fixed opinions on all theological and Church questions, and a consequent condemnation of those who differ, we cannot lay claim to it. Such a spirit would be alien to the objects for which Wycliffe Hall was founded."—*Four Years' Work at Wycliffe Hall*, p. 3. For information concerning the Hall I am indebted to the kindness of the Principal, the Rev. R. B. Girdlestone.

from the Prayer-book was used each morning in the library and lecture-room. The first Principal was the Rev. Robert Baker Girdlestone, author of *The Synonyms of the Old Testament*, and other works.

Ridley Hall, Cambridge, was opened in January 1881. Its governing body, like that of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, was a council, elected in the first place by a body of subscribers, and subsequently co-optative; and no authority in the Church was *ex officio* a member. The students, being still members of their several colleges in the University, were free to attend their several college chapels; but for residents, a shortened form of Mattins was said in the library daily, and followed by an exposition of the Greek Testament; and instead of Evensong a sort of "family prayer." The first Principal was the Rev. Handley Carr Glyn Moule, contributor to Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, and author of various poems and other works.*

* For information concerning Ridley Hall, I am indebted to the kindness of the Principal, the Rev. H. C. G. Moule.

CHAPTER LXV.

Immoral Period, continued. St. Peter's, London Docks. Attempts of the "Church Association" to molest the Clergy there. Failure. Subsequent Conduct of the Association.

"Quid. . . . tam malignum quam nolle prodesse, cum possis, quam utilitate cruciari, quam injuriam sinere?"—TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.* i. 22.

OUR readers will not have forgotten the account which we gave of the way in which Catholicism was suppressed in the year 1860 in the Church of St. George-in-the-East, after a course of sacrilegious ruffianism, abetted both by the Bishop of the diocese, and also by the Government. Happily, the suppression of Catholicism in that church did not involve the suppression of Catholicism throughout the parish. A mission had been established in Wellclose Square, under energetic clergy; and one result had been the formation of a district parish, with a new church, known as that of St. Peter, London Docks. The Rev. Charles Fuge Lowder was instituted as its first incumbent. Mr. Lowder had served as curate of the mother-church in the days of Mr. Bryan King. The congregation gathered under him had been trained from the first in Catholic belief and Catholic practice; and few priests, we suppose, have succeeded in winning the love of their flocks as fully as Mr. Lowder had succeeded in winning the love of his. The ritual, however, at St. Peter's Church was of the most extreme character. We suppose that every mediæval usage was adopted which could on any

pretence, however strained, be deemed consistent with the Book of Common Prayer: Roman precedent, however, being preferred to that of Sarum where there was a difference. The reason of this probably was, that the Roman usages were generally of a less elaborate character than those of Sarum, although English Churchmen might have been expected to have a preference for the latter, in consequence of their wide acceptance in pre-Reformation times, and of their affording a testimony to the independence of the Church of England.

The congregation of St. Peter's was not an influential one, save in those ranks from which it was mainly drawn, and in that neighbourhood—one of the worst in London—where it was known. It may, indeed, be questioned whether any person resident within the district (except the clergy and the Sisters of Mercy) had sufficient knowledge of Church matters for telling the difference between the "Church Association" and the English Church Union. With most or all of these poor people the only alternatives were, Catholicism as taught by Mr. Lowder, and practical heathenism. Nor, even when they had been converted to the former, could they be expected to do much in the way of making other converts to the religion which they had adopted.

Hence it might have been thought that St. Peter's, London Docks, might have been beneath the notice of an Association which had its office running out of the Strand; and that its priests and people might have been let alone to go on in

their own ways, especially if the Bishop was disinclined to interfere. The "Church Association," however, took a different view. Their object was not to leave a single Ritualist unmolested throughout the Church of England; and every Ritualistic church, however practically insignificant, was as a thorn in their sides, the cause of a perpetual irritation. We now transcribe a few passages from Mr. Lowder's biography, which have respect to the year 1869:—

"The 'Church Association' tried in vain for eight months during this year to discover and utilise an 'aggrieved parishioner.' Possibly the insurmountable difficulty of the attempt may have been enhanced by the dangers to which the aggrieved one would have been exposed. It would not have been an enviable office amongst people who plainly said that any folks who came down there to worry 'the Father' would be thrown into the river by the men, and have their eyes scratched out by the women. 'Let them come on, we're ready for 'em,' a sturdy farrier was heard to say, baring a formidable arm. 'I took my pattens to church,' an old woman said to the Sisters, 'and kept them in my lap, ready to heave at them if they came near him.'

"Mr. Linklater gives the following account of the matter:—

"'Many an attempt was made by the Church Association to attack such an important stronghold, but with no success. Their agents had been down frequently to stir up strife and try to get some of the parishioners to lend their names to the

proceedings against Mr. Lowder. But for a long time it seemed hopeless. It was commonly said in the parish that money was offered for the accommodation. At last three persons, none of whom ever attended the church, and two of whom were Dissenters, one being a preacher in the next parish, were pressed into the service. Mr. Lowder told me, shortly before his death, with the most charming glee, that he had made friends with the two persons who were most bitter enemies in the matter.’” *

Mr. Linklater continues, as his words are given in Mr. Lowder’s biography :—

“ ‘ Two spies of the Church Association appeared one day in the front seats and began taking notes ; and I am sorry to say that our churchwarden, who is a most respected lighterman, walked up quietly to these gentlemen, and whispered, “ If you go on with this ’ere, there’s half-a-dozen men behind you will crack your heads.” The note-books were put up at once.

“ ‘ A visit from the Deptford mob to St. Peter’s had been threatened, to avenge the protection given by our people to Mr. Tooth. There was the greatest excitement in our parish, and each Sunday the church was crammed with our own men, determined to protect the sanctity of the house of God. The rioters never dared to come.

“ ‘ On one of the saints’ days an agitator appeared at the children’s service, and when it was over he shouted out in church, “ What would Ridley think

* *Charles Lowder : a Biography*, London, 1881, pp. 241-2.

of this?” The children were much astonished, and did not understand the allusion, so after church they followed the gentleman up the street, singing, “I’m old Bob Ridley, O,” the only Ridley they had ever heard of. He never came again.’”*

Two presentments, however, were got up against Mr. Lowder; though, again, these were not in the way of prosecution, but only asking the Bishop to use fatherly methods for inducing Mr. Lowder to conform to Privy Council law. This, however, it need not be said, Mr. Lowder did not dream of doing; for, on the one hand, he had never promised to conform to whatever the Judicial Committee might choose to declare as law, and, on the other hand, he had promised very solemnly to conform to the rules of the Prayer-book. Then, on the 15th of November, 1878, a representation was sent up under the Public Worship Regulation Act, by three persons, whose names have not transpired, but who posed as aggrieved parishioners. In this representation Mr. Lowder was charged with twenty alleged illegalities, including “processions, useless candles, Romish vestments [probably the Eucharistic vestments], wafers, mixture of wine and water, hiding the manual acts, elevation, bowing, crossing, kissing [probably kissing the Gospel], censuring, ringing [probably at the consecration of the elements], and singing the *Agnus Dei*; also setting up in the church a second so-called altar, a confessional box, a set of pictures called the Stations of the Cross, a cross on the Communion-table,

* *Charles Lowder : a Biography*, p. 244

and near the pulpit a crucifix three feet long.”* This representation, however, was unsuccessful. The Bishop of London possessed a remote interest in the patronage of the benefice, and on this account Bishop Jackson referred the representation to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait); and the Archbishop put his veto on the proceedings, on the ground that the case would be affected by a recent decision of the Queen’s Bench Division in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*.

While on the subject of the conduct of the “Church Association” with respect to St. Peter’s, London Docks, it is sad to notice how, at a later period, being foiled in their endeavours to stop the Catholic ritual there carried on, the Association had recourse to the circulation of what was tantamount to direct falsehood. It is well known to persons who are acquainted with such matters that, with reference to certain minor liturgical ceremonies not expressly specified in the Book of Common Prayer, two sets of usages obtain in Catholic churches of the Anglican rite—that is to say, the usage of Rome and that of Sarum; these usages having respect to the colours employed in vesting the altar and ministers, the manner of doing reverence at certain parts of the service, and such-like matters, which the Prayer-book leaves without making any specific provision. For instance, on some days the altar and ministers will be vested in green according to Roman usage, but in red according to the usage of Sarum: and at some part of the service the reverence will be

* *Report of the “Church Association” for 1883, p. 41.*

done by genuflexion according to Rome, but, according to Sarum, by simply bowing the head. Now in the *Times* of Monday, the 11th of February, 1884, an account had been given of the service in St. Peter's Church on the Saturday before; and the reporter stated that in the celebration of Holy Communion *the Roman use was closely followed*. This statement, true, no doubt, in reference to that minute ceremonial whereto we have just referred, had nevertheless a manifest falsehood when placed before the general public without qualification or explanation: for it would manifestly be understood to mean that the Book of Common Prayer had been for the time laid aside, and the Roman Missal put in its place. In this unqualified form, however, the Church Association was not ashamed to publish it in their report for 1883;* and the lie was repeated by "Church Association" lecturers in their country addresses.

* Page 42.

CHAPTER LXVI.

Immoral Period, continued. Various Prosecutions and Attempts. Conduct of the Rev. R. O. T. Thorpe. More Attempts at Prosecution. Low-Church Conduct at the Sheffield Church Congress. Prosecution of the Rev. P. Ahier for speaking ill of the *Rock*.

“The law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth: for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth.”—HABAKKUK i. 4.

THE persecution of Catholic priests by Low-Churchmen still went on. We are now at the year 1878. In the January of that year the Rev. Charles Norwood Oliver, Chaplain of the Royal Hospital for Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport, had a slight experience of Low-Church antagonism. Two brother-clergymen attended the annual meeting of the subscribers, and, by way of attacking Mr. Oliver for his High-Church principles, moved an amendment to the customary vote of thanks to the officers of the institution. The amendment, however, was lost. Later on in the same year, five clergymen—Messrs. Aldwell, Boyce, Goundry, Martin, and Parry—joined with three Dissenting preachers in a meeting held for the purpose of attacking the same gentleman on the ground of his being a member of the English Church Union, and an associate of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. In the month of February proceedings were taken by the “Church Association” against the Rev. Tufnell Samuel Barrett, Vicar of St. George’s, Barrow-in-Furness; and certain parishioners of Barrow-in-Furness, by name John

Huddleston, Richard Fletcher Towers, George Joseph Brooks Sansam, John Bailie Bolton, and Joseph Pearson, complained to the Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Harvey Goodwin) on account of the following practices adopted by Mr. Barrett:— (1) Use of lighted candles, (2) use of a stole, and (apparently) the other Eucharistic vestments as well, (3) bowing or prostration during the Nicene Creed, (4) elevation of the Eucharistic elements, (5) taking the eastward position, (6) bowing or prostration during the Consecration-prayer, (7) use of the mixed chalice, (8) signing the cross towards the congregation, (9) using the church-porch as a confessional. The Bishop thereupon prohibited Mr. Barrett from the *second* and *ninth* of these practices, but refused to interfere with him in regard of any of the rest. Afterwards a person named Hurford sent in a representation under the Public Worship Regulation Act, but the Bishop refused to allow proceedings to be taken. As, however, the Bishop had required Mr. Barrett to disobey one of the plain directions of the Prayer-book, Mr. Barrett, rather than break his promise of conformity, and not being prepared to make fight, resigned his benefice.

Another attack was made about the same time upon the Rev. Charles Bodington, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wolverhampton. On the 22nd of January a third representation was made to the Archbishop of Canterbury under the Public Worship Regulation Act, by Mr. Joseph Butcher, one of the churchwardens, asking that steps might be taken for compelling Mr. Bodington to desist from

the practices whereof complaint had been made; and which were, (1) the use of "illegal" vestments, (2) the use of altar-lights, (3) facing east at the Consecration, (4) facing east at the Lord's Prayer and Collect for purity, (5) elevating the paten and cup, (6) using the mixed chalice, (7) using wafer-bread, (8) kneeling and bowing in the Consecration-prayer, (9) signing the cross toward the congregation, (10) "illegal" processions, (11) singing the *Agnus Dei*. And about the same time the vicars and churchwardens of seven Wolverhampton churches wrote to the Bishop of Lichfield asking him to deprive Mr. Bodington of the privilege of acting upon his own conscientious convictions. The Bishop, however, replied that he would not have his fatherly admonition mixed up with a legal process. The Archbishop, moreover, refused to comply with the prosecutor's wishes, as his Grace's suggestion previously made had not been acted upon.* It is to be observed, too, that the Bishop failed to send Mr. Bodington a copy of the representation within the prescribed time; so that the suit would have failed on that account alone.

On the 5th of February complaint was made to the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Thorold) against the Rev. George William Berkeley, Vicar of All Hallows, Southwark, by Alfred Side, of 128 Union Street, Borough, schoolmaster, and George Newton, of Union Street, Borough, builder, on account of the following practices:—(1) Use of the stole,

* Statement of the "Church Association," cited in the *Church Times* of January 17, 1879.

(2) use of altar-lights; (3) bowing or prostration in the Nicene Creed; (4) elevation of the paten and cup; (5) the eastward position; (6) bowing and prostration during the Consecration-prayer; (7) use of the mixed chalice; (8) signing the cross on his forehead and towards the congregation in the Nicene Creed, in the Absolution, in the Communion-service, and before or after the consecration of the elements; (9) administering Holy Communion to women dressed like nuns, and professing to be Catholics and not Protestants; (10) being served by an acolyte. Subsequently eight of these charges were repeated, including the first, the seventh, the eighth, and the ninth. The Bishop desired Mr. Berkeley to desist from the use of the mixed chalice, and from signing the cross in the manner whereof complaint had been made. Mr. Berkeley promised compliance, and the Bishop thereupon intimated his intention of supporting him. In a printed statement, however, subsequently issued, the "Church Association" falsely asserted that Mr. Berkeley had promised the Bishop to discontinue all of what they termed the "illegal practices."

On the 28th of the same month complaint was made to the Archbishop of Canterbury against the Ven. Edward Glover, Vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton, and who had been formerly Archdeacon of Georgetown in South Africa, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Capetown, by a person named Howard and three others, alleged parishioners, for—(1) wearing "illegal" vestments, (2) use of altar-lights, (3) taking the

eastward position in the Consecration-prayer, (4) using the mixed chalice, (5) using wafer-bread, (6) "illegal" processions, (7) singing the *Agnus Dei*.* It was on the same day that the complaint had been preferred against Mr. Bodington, and the suit was vetoed by the Archbishop, as the suit against Mr. Bodington had been vetoed, and on similar grounds. The new Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan) requested Mr. Glover to cease using the altar-lights, the mixed chalice, and wafer-bread, but refused to interfere in regard of the other matters of complaint.

About the same time there was such an exhibition of hostility on the part of an individual against the Catholic party as was unusual even among Low-Churchmen, who were, however, becoming bolder as the persecution went on, and as it was favoured by those in authority. The Rev. Richard Oscar Tugwell Thorpe was Vicar of Christ Church, Old Kent Road, Camberwell. The Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Thorold) had fixed to hold a confirmation in that church; and the Rev. John Going, Vicar of St. Paul's, Walworth, and the Rev. Richard Rhodes Bristow, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Lewisham, both in that neighbourhood, had written to Mr. Thorpe announcing their intention of sending candidates; besides which, Mr. Bristow had asked whether he should bring surplice or gown. Mr. Thorpe replied that he had proclaimed from his pulpit the opinion that "the existence of secret societies of the character

* Statement of the "Church Association" cited in the *Church Times* of January 17, 1879.

of the Society of the Holy Cross and of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament" was "a scandal and a shame;" and that he had expressed to many his conviction that members of those societies "must have traitorous designs against" the Church of England. (The reader will note, by the way, the tacit assumption of personal infallibility thus made; as though the fact of a Low-Church clergyman's having said a thing were a sufficient guarantee of the certainty of the thing affirmed.) And then, after informing his two clerical brethren severally that they were marked in the *Rock's* list of "conspirators" as belonging to the obnoxious societies, he added that there could be no communion between him and them, and that he could not with any comfort, or even honesty, receive their Confirmation-candidates; as if the admission of their candidates lay within his responsibility at all! One of the clergymen thus addressed having replied in such terms as the arrogant impertinence of Mr. Thorpe deserved, the latter had the hardihood to rejoin as though he were an injured party. The matter ended by the Bishop's holding the Confirmation in Mr. Bristow's church instead of Mr. Thorpe's.*

In the month of April, a representation was sent to the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Moberly), charging the Rev. Horace Edward Chapman, Rector of Donhead, St. Andrew's, Salisbury, with elevating the consecrated elements; bowing and prostration; intentional hiding of the manual acts of consecration; using unleavened bread, dough,

or wafers; wearing a coloured stole; using the altar-lights, and using the mixed chalice. The representation (which was made under the Public Worship Regulation Act) was signed by Sir Thomas Fraser Grove, Bart., Henry Singleton, and Walter John Grove (apparently the eldest son of Sir Thomas). The Bishop, however, refused (April 13) to allow further proceedings.

On the 24th of May complaint was laid against the Rev. George Edward Redhead, Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Manningham, near Bradford, in the Diocese of Ripon, by Edwin Wood, William John Elliott, William Thornton, and Alexander Ridding, for walking in procession, use of altar-lights, wearing a vestment (probably a chasuble), facing east, using the mixed chalice, using wafer-bread, "bowing to consecrated elements," singing the *Agnus Dei*, signing the cross towards the congregation, removing the alms to the credence instead of letting them remain on the altar till the end of the service, and allowing a cross to be over the Communion-table. The Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth) informed the complainants that he had not succeeded in inducing Mr. Redhead to give up the practices specified, and that they could proceed under the Public Worship Regulation Act. Another attempt appears to have been made by the same party against Mr. Redhead, but to have failed because no proceedings could be taken under the Act until the 2nd of July, 1879—a year after the new parish had been constituted.

In the month of June a presentment was made to the Bishop of London against the Rev. George

Boker, Perpetual Curate of St. John the Baptist, Kensington, for processions, lighted candles, use of a vestment (probably a chasuble), removing alms from the altar to the credence, facing east when consecrating the elements (or, as the "Church Association" chose to express it, "hiding manual acts"), elevation of the elements, mixing water with the wine, singing the *Agnus Dei*, ceremonial signing of the cross in the air, and the use of a cross. The complainants were two persons named Bannister and Knight, alleged to be parishioners; but the Bishop appears to have taken no notice of their presentment.

About the same time complaints were made to the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Fraser) against the Rev. Francis Hill Arbuthnot Wright, Vicar of St. Mark's, Pendleton, Manchester, for introducing a Litany-desk and the Eucharistic lights, and for raising the Communion-table nine inches, thus necessitating its approach by steps, and so contravening the precept in Exodus xx. 26!*

Probably in the December of this same year (1878) complaint was made to the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Durnford) against the Rev. Robert Biscoe Tritton, Vicar of Bognor, for the eastward position; standing west of the table at the Epistle and Gospel; omitting the words "and oblations" from the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church (we presume, when there was to be no

* "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto Mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." Apparently Mr. Wright's opponents had learnt that the Communion-table was substantially an altar.

celebration); “illegal ordering of elements;” “at the Prayer of Consecration hiding manual acts;” “bowing to a metal cross on Communion-table;” “introduction of a cross without a faculty; introduction of a re-table without a faculty; concealment of the Ten Commandments; Curate wearing stole; Curate prostrating himself; “Vicar and Curate alleging that conduct adjudged to be illegal was done with consent of the Bishop.” (It will be noticed how eager the complainants were, or wished to seem, against the publishing of any libellous statement against their right reverend Father in God. This eagerness was not always manifested by members of the “Church Association.”) The persons complaining were, a Major-General F. B. Boleau, alleged to be a parishioner, and another resident. The Bishop replied on the 4th of December, refusing to take order; and on the following grounds:—(1) There was some informality in the presentment itself; (2) one of the complainants did not appear to have sufficient interest in the church; and (3) General Boleau did not appear to have frequented the services of which he had complained, nor to have the general feeling of the congregation in his favour.

The Church Congress this year was held at Sheffield; and the Vicar of Sheffield (the Rev. John Edward Blakeney) and his friends followed the tactics of some Low-Churchmen at a former Congress, and endeavoured to exclude from the Subjects-Committee all clergymen who had been the subjects of Low-Church prosecution or were members of the Society of the Holy Cross. In this, however, they failed.

The proceedings of the Low-Church party, however, were diversified this year with a prosecution of a different character from most of those described as yet. We have already spoken of the *Rock* newspaper. That newspaper was published at an office which had distinguished itself in the Low-Church interest by other publications as well. It was here that that pamphlet was published to which we have already referred incidentally—*The Ritualistic Conspiracy*—which involved a libel in its very title, and at least one of those half-truths which are the worst lies. Now it happened that a Broad-Church clergyman—the Rev. Philippe Ahier, who had been a pupil of M. de Pressensé, and was, at the time whereof we now speak, Vicar of Glaisdale, in Yorkshire—had said, in the course of an address to the supporters of his parochial church reading-room:—

“I thank all those who have sent me newspapers for the reading-room, with the exception of those who have sent me the *Rock* and the *Police News*—two of the most sensational papers published: one with its pictures of horrors, the other with its from-time-to-time graphic description of the evils of the confessional, both largely drawn from the imagination, and its weekly budget of misstatements about clergymen in all parts of England. I, nevertheless, give it credit of a desire to combat the debasing evils of the confessional; but, to my mind, the publication of the evil is to spread it, and though it styles itself a family Church of England newspaper, its entire production is violently inimical to the

Church. For this reason I do not think that either of these papers is fit to be placed in the hands of young men, or to be seen in any private or public society; at all events not in the Church Institute.”

Considering a certain libel against the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland which the *Rock* had once published, our readers may perhaps think that Mr. Ahier's censure of that paper was not undeserved; for in the first week of October 1877 the following passage had appeared in the *Rock*:—“The much-vaunted superior chastity of Irish girls is a myth. It is seeming, not real. In the rural districts of Ireland the priest is the seducer of the parish; and the early improvident marriages of the young people are encouraged by him to conceal his immorality. There is not and cannot be chastity where Popery reigns.” When, however, Lord Oramore and Browne had written (as his Lordship did at once, his letter appearing in the next issue of the *Rock*) to disclaim the casting such a “calumnious and untrue” imputation on the Roman Catholic priesthood in the sister island, the Editor admitted that while he “felt bound” to insert the libel, he did not himself believe it! thus shutting himself up to the charge of having “felt bound” to insert it in the Protestant interest, irrespectively of its truth or falsehood.

Therefore, we repeat, our readers may perhaps think that such a newspaper was really, as Mr. Ahier had said, unfit to be placed in the hands of young men, or to be seen in any private or public

society. The publishers, however, professed themselves aggrieved by what had thus fallen from the Vicar of Glaisdale; and so, it was said, did the publishers of the *Police News*. And the publishers of the *Rock* took proceedings against Mr. Ahier for £2,000 damages.

The case came before Mr. Justice Field and a special jury, in the Queen's Bench Division. In the course of the trial the plaintiffs' counsel tried to make it appear that Mr. Ahier was a Ritualist, and backed up by the Ritualist party, and apparently for the sake of prejudicing the jury against him; the fact being that Mr. Ahier had never been a member of that party. The verdict went against him, but the jury would not give Messrs. Collingridge more than £25 damages; and the publishers of the *Police News* deemed it best to say nothing about the alleged libel against their own print. Mr. Ahier afterwards became Incumbent of the French Episcopal Church, New Oxford Street, London.

CHAPTER LXVII.

Immoral Period, continued. Prosecution of Canon Carter. Bishop Ellicott and Mr. Ward of St. Raphael's, Bristol. Persecution of the Rev. T. Pelham Dale.

“Now hath pride and rebuke gotten strength, and the time of destruction, and the wrath of indignation.”—1 MACCABEES ii. 49.

WE have seen how Mr. Bulkeley's information against Canon Carter had succeeded in the year 1877.* We do not know whether Mr. Bulkeley had anything to do with the next proceedings taken against the Canon; but be that as it may, on the 11th of July, 1878, a physician named Frederick Guilden Julius, who resided mostly in Egypt, but spent a small part of every year at Clewer, instructed his solicitor to transmit to the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness) a letter signed by him (Dr. Julius), and charging Mr. Carter with the following practices:—Using the mixed chalice; facing east in the Prayer of Consecration; bowing towards and over the Holy Table in the Prayer of Consecration; signing the cross towards the people in absolution, in ministering the Communion, and in the final benediction; elevating the paten and chalice, “which had been respectively placed on the Holy Table in an unauthorised manner;” using the Eucharistic lights; and singing the *Agnus Dei* immediately after the Prayer of Consecration. In the same letter Dr. Julius asked the Bishop to issue a commission of inquiry under the “Act for the Better Enforcing Church Discipline;” or, in case the Bishop should think proper, to send the case

* See above, p. 355.

in the first instance by Letters of Request to the Court of Appeal for the province, in accordance with the thirteenth section of the said Act : that is, we suppose, under the late unhappy circumstances of the Church, the Court of Lord Penzance.

The Bishop endeavoured to put the matter off, Canon Carter being esteemed by the Catholic party one of the most excellent priests in the Church. Nor had the Bishop given any definite answer by the 7th of November, on which day Dr. Julius went abroad. Meanwhile a person named E. W. Ilyd Peterson, of 26A Bury Street, St. James's, London, had attended St. Andrew's, Clewer, on three several days, apparently in the capacity of a spy, and on the 23rd of January, 1879, an affidavit by him, deposing to the truth of the charges made against Canon Carter by Dr. Julius, was brought into the Court of Queen's Bench before the Lord Chief Justice (Sir Alexander Cockburn) and Mr. Baron Pollock, in support of a *mandamus* compelling the Bishop of Oxford to issue a commission of inquiry with respect to the said charges, under the Clergy Discipline Act. The judgment of the court was given on the 8th of March, to the effect that the applicant was entitled to a *mandamus* compelling the Bishop either to issue a commission or to send the case to what was termed the Court of Arches. Against this judgment both the Bishop and Canon Carter appealed. Their appeal was heard before the Lord Justices Bramwell, Baggallay, and Thesiger, and judgment was given on the 30th of May, 1879. The appeal was allowed, with costs—that is, costs as if there had been only one appellant.

From this decision of the Court of Appeal Dr. Julius appealed to the House of Lords; and his appeal was heard on the 4th of March, 1880, by the Lord Chancellor (Earl Cairns), Lord Penzance, Lord Selborne, and Lord Blackburn; who, on the 22nd of the same month, pronounced in favour of the Bishop, and gave him his costs. The *animus* of the Government was shown at this time in a way which did not commend itself to the good opinion of independent observers. Dr. Stephens said in the course of one of his arguments that the Bishop was one of the Queen's judges. Lord Penzance was one of the Queen's judges beyond all question. But while the Government paid the expenses of Lord Penzance in appealing against the Court of Queen's Bench, they would not pay a farthing of what had been incurred by the Bishop of Oxford.

The final decision having thus been given for the Bishop, Canon Carter offered to resign, from personal consideration for his Lordship. Before the Bishop could take action thereupon, a meeting of parishioners was held, at which a resolution was passed deprecating Canon Carter's resignation; but Canon Carter declined to withdraw it, and thus the Low-Church party gained over him what was tantamount to a victory, though Dr. Julius's costs had to be paid by the "Church Association."

In the spring of 1878 a stain was brought upon the English Episcopate by the official conduct of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott) towards the Rev. Arthur Hawkins Ward, in the interests of the Low-Church party as represented by the "Church Association." The institution of

St. Raphael's, Bristol, had been founded in or about the year 1858 by the Rev. Robert Miles.* It consisted of a church with six almshouses attached, the almshouses being meant for aged seamen. The church was opened, on a licence from Bishop Baring, on the 2nd of May, 1859: was largely attended both by the poor of the neighbourhood and by a large number of people from Clifton, but had never been consecrated. The services had been noted for their devotion; and Mr. Ward, who had been appointed to the charge, had, it seems, been the first to introduce advanced ritual into any church in Bristol. He, his patron, his assistant, and his people were in perfect harmony. The Bishop, moreover, had, it appears, promised not to interfere with the services of the church as long as they were conducted in conformity with certain resolutions which had passed in Convocation.

In December 1877 Mr. Ward had been working for nineteen years at St. Raphael's, on an endowment of £63 per annum, made up to £120 by the founder during his lifetime; but this sum he paid to an assistant-clergyman, subsisting himself on his own private means.

The local branch of the "Church Association" was, it may be conceived, sorely vexed at this state of things; and it was reported that it had tried to get up a prosecution against Mr. Ward, but had failed, no third person having been found to pose

* These and other particulars are chiefly taken from a pamphlet published by the Church Printing Company, and entitled *St. Raphael's, Bristol. The Church closed by a Bishop. Statement and Correspondence.*

as an aggrieved parishioner. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Ward himself furnished an occasion, of which both the Bishop and the "Church Association" were only too glad to take advantage. In a passage from Bishop Ellicott's *Historical Lectures*,* cited by Canon Cooke in the appendix to his *Power of the Priesthood in Absolution*, the Bishop had said: "The mysterious power of binding and loosing had reference not merely to the general power of receiving into the Church or the contrary, but to . . . disciplinary power over members of it, both in respect of the retaining or absolving of sins." In his charge, however, delivered in the course of this year, his Lordship had said: "In the ordination of priests no supernatural gift is given differing, either in degree or kind, from that possessed by all Christians." And Mr. Ward had in a speech drawn public attention to the inconsistency of these two pronouncements. Thereupon the Bishop wrote to the "Church Association" to the effect that he saw a way in which the Ritualistic practices at St. Raphael's could be stopped, and requesting the officers of the "Church Association" to get up a complaint. Forthwith Mr. Inskip, president of the local branch, attended a service at St. Raphael's, took notes of what he witnessed there, and got together three inhabitants of Bedminster, the parish in which St. Raphael's was situated, to pose as aggrieved parishioners, and make a complaint against Mr. Ward. On the receipt of this complaint the Bishop wrote to Mr. Ward, December 8,

* Page 403.

1877, requesting him to desist from the following practices :—

The use of vestments.

The use of lighted candles at the Holy Communion, unless when needed to give light.

The ceremonial mixing of water with the wine, and the administration of it, when so mixed, at the Holy Communion.

The use of incense in or before Divine Service, or during the Holy Communion, so as to be in any way subsidiary thereto.

The Bishop requested Mr. Ward, further, not to kneel during the Prayer of Consecration, not to elevate the elements, not to make the sign of the cross when reading the Absolution in the Communion Service, before giving the elements, or when pronouncing the Benediction ; and to remove the pictures on the walls of the chapel representing the Stations of the Cross, and the crucifix as well, unless forming part of an architectural decoration. These paintings, it should be observed, had been presented to the church in handsome frames by a working milkman, and had cost three or four pounds apiece.

Hereupon ensued a correspondence ; in the course of which the Bishop, without disclosing the names of the complainants, threatened “ to take ” (as he said) “ ulterior proceedings ” in case Mr. Ward let the next Sunday (which was the 16th of December) pass without complying with his Lordship’s directions ; and Mr. Ward, addressing himself to the matter of vestments alone, gave the Bishop his reasons for not complying. In a conversation

with the Archdeacon of Bristol (the Ven. Henry Goldney Randall), whom the Bishop had requested to see Mr. Ward on the subject of the correspondence, it was stated that Mr. Ward had no right to remove the pictures or the crucifix, those things being the property of Mr. Miles the founder; and that on all other points he would obey the Bishop, except in the use of vestments, the retention of at least two lights on the altar, and the mixed chalice. On the 3rd of January, 1878, came a formal monition from the Bishop bidding Mr. Ward to comply with all the directions given in his letter of the 8th of December (which were specified at length), except only that concerning the signing of the cross; and requiring Mr. Ward to notify in writing within a month that he had done so; informing him, moreover, that if he failed to do as bidden his licence would be withdrawn.

Mr. Ward replied on the 30th of January, to the effect that the pictures and crucifix had been removed, and that he had complied with the Bishop's other directions by desisting on and since the previous Sunday from celebrating the Holy Eucharist at all. The Bishop, however, was determined to drive Mr. Ward into a corner, and therefore wrote again, charging him not to withhold the Holy Communion from the worshippers at St. Raphael's: whereupon Mr. Ward resumed the celebration according to the Book of Common Prayer—that is to say, with the Eucharistic vestments, the two altar-lights, and the mixed chalice.

The patron of the institution remonstrated with the Bishop, reminding him of his promise not to

interfere with the services of the church. The Bishop, however, replied that it was quite true he did say something of the kind, but he had seen reason to alter his opinion since the law had been proclaimed on the subject by the Ridsdale Judgment.* And on March 22, 1878, the Bishop inhibited Mr. Ward from officiating either in St. Raphael's Church or in the almshouses belonging to it; which inhibition was duly served on the 30th.

Thus a church in which for nearly twenty years there had been two celebrations of the Holy Eucharist every Sunday, and one celebration every week besides, was altogether closed; a congregation, including three hundred regular communicants, scattered; and two earnest priests sent adrift; and all this for no pretended cause save that the priest in chief responsibility insisted on keeping his promise of conformity to the Prayer-book, irrespectively of Privy-Council lies.

We must now turn our eyes again to the metropolis. The Rev. Thomas Pelham Dale had been, ever since the 23rd of April, 1847, Rector of the united parishes of St. Vedast, Foster Lane, and St. Michael-le-Querne, in the City: and had laid himself open to the special malice of the "Church Association" by inviting the congregation of St. Alban's, Holborn, to his church, for the six weeks during which their clergyman, the Rev. Alexander Heriot Mackonochie, had been under Sir Robert Phillimore's suspension. A suit was therefore un-

* Speech by Dr. F. G. Swayne, at a meeting of friends and sympathisers of Mr. Ward, January 21, 1878.

dertaken, under the Public Worship Regulation Act, in the names of John Clifford Sergeant, of Gutter Lane, bootmaker; Robert George Morley, of Carey Lane, warehouseman, and said to be a Dissenter; J. Horwood, of Paternoster Row, auctioneer, and who did not receive Holy Communion at St. Vedast's; and a trunkmaker named Bengough; the two former of whom were churchwardens of St. Vedast, and the two latter churchwardens of St. Michael-le-Querne. Sergeant, it should be remarked, had been formally presented to Bishop Claughton, the Archdeacon, for absenting himself from Communion for more than twenty years: he had, in fact, never been known to communicate for fully thirty-two years. No one of the nominal complainants had attended the church before the advanced ritual was introduced in 1873; and when the ritual was altered by the intruding priest, Mr. Acland, in accordance with their wishes, they did not attend the church even then. The "Church Association," however, were the real prosecutors. It should be observed, too, that Mr. Dale, at the commencement of his incumbency, had had no congregation at all. When, however, the Rev. B. Morgan Cowie, Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Jewry, had been promoted to the Deanery of Manchester, and on the accession to St. Lawrence's of an incumbent of different religious views, the choir of St. Lawrence's and the greater part of the congregation ceased to attend that church; whereupon Mr. Dale let them know that he would be glad to welcome the choir at his church; and to St. Vedast's accordingly they attached themselves.

About the same time Mr. Dale commenced various ritual improvements. This was in 1873. The charges now brought against him were these:— Use of the Eucharistic lights; wearing “unlawful” vestments—alb, maniple, chasuble, stole, biretta; facing east when consecrating the elements; bowing at the time of consecration; use of wafer-bread; use of the mixed chalice; elevating the paten and chalice; signing the cross towards the congregation; having the great bell of the church tolled during the Consecration-prayer; elevating the alms above his head; and singing the *Agnus Dei*. The result was that Mr. Dale was inhibited and suspended by Lord Penzance for three months, and thereafter until he should conform to what the noble lord called law. The Bishop of London himself undertook at first the Sunday duty at St. Vedast’s, and Mr. Dale did not oppose his doing it.

An appeal, however, was made to the Court of Queen’s Bench; which, in July 1877, declared Lord Penzance’s sentence to be null and void, the Bishop of London having acted contrarily to the statute in the initiatory proceedings, by sending the representation to the judge. Mr. Dale thereupon resumed the exercise of his rights. Afterwards a second suit was instituted by the same parties who had promoted the former one; but this also failed, from want of time to obtain a bishop to act under section 16, in lieu of the archbishop of the province and the bishop of the diocese, who were the alternate patrons of Mr. Dale’s benefice. Then followed a third suit, on a complaint made by the

churchwardens on the 12th of July, 1878. In this latter suit the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Temple) was appointed by the Queen to act in all matters arising out of the representation. Lord Penzance held a court on the 10th of January, 1879, in Committee Room D of the House of Lords. The promoters asked hereat for a monition against Mr. Dale. Lord Penzance reserved his judgment for the present, but on the 8th of February ordered a monition to be issued enjoining Mr. Dale to discontinue the practices whereof complaint had been made; he also inhibited him from officiating, and condemned him in costs. This monition was issued on the 21st. On the 19th of the following March an inhibition was issued in consequence of Mr. Dale's disregard of the monition; and this also Mr. Dale disregarded. On the 12th of December Lord Penzance, sitting in one of the dressing-rooms of the House of Lords, in his ordinary clothes, pronounced Mr. Dale contumacious and in contempt for his non-payment of costs, which costs amounted to £169 7s. 2d. Some items in the bill were stated by Mr. Dale, in a letter to the *Church Times*, to be of the same character as a more famous (or infamous) bill of costs of which we shall hereafter make due mention. On the 13th of March, 1880, Lord Penzance granted an inhibition against Mr. Dale, and ordered Mr. Dale to pay the costs. On Palm Sunday (the 21st of March) the Rev. — Acland appeared at St. Vedast's, having been sent by the Bishop to do Mr. Dale's duty. Mr. Dale, however, insisted on doing it himself, and Mr. Acland thereupon retired. And

here we must leave Mr. Dale for the present, to see what the "Church Association" had been doing in the case of two other Ritualistic clergymen, Messrs. Green and Enraght.

CHAPTER LXVIII.

Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. S. F. Green. Prayer-book Revision Society and Bill. The Deans' Memorial in favour of Toleration. Counter-memorials. Bills for amending the Clergy Discipline Act and Public Worship Regulation Act. Release of Mr. Green.

"Faciunt hi plura; sed illos
Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone phalanges."
JUVENAL, *Sat.* ii. 45, 46.

"These perform more work; but those are defended by number, Standing close and thick, with shields compacted together."

MILES PLATTING is a suburb of Manchester. The parish of St. John the Evangelist contained in 1877 about 4,851 souls: and here the Rev. Sidney Faithorn Green had been labouring for about ten years, having been instituted in 1869 on the nomination of Sir T. Perceval Heywood, Bart. The income of the living was £250 a year; there was also a parsonage-house, which Mr. Green's former parishioners had enabled him to furnish to a great extent with gifts from themselves—tokens of their regard for him. He had been Curate of Swindon, in Wiltshire.

Of course a pronounced Churchman could not be let alone by the Low-Churchmen of Manchester; and thus in 1878 a memorial to the Bishop (Dr.

Fraser) was got up against Mr. Green, the character of which memorial occasioned the Bishop to acknowledge it in these terms:—"Manchester, May 20th, 1878.—Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a petition signed (you inform me) by 320 parishioners of St. John the Evangelist, Miles Platting, in which the petitioners publicly testify to the propagation of false doctrine and deadly error by the Rev. S. F. Green, and call upon me to use the power committed to me to eradicate this abominable idolatry. I respectfully submit to the parishioners that as no particulars of the 'idolatry or false doctrine or deadly error' alleged are given, I can take no steps either by way of remonstrance or otherwise against the inculcated clergyman. I have not counted the signatures to the petition, but I observe on examination of it that whole families of five, six, and seven persons have signed it at once, and that whole groups of signatures are evidently in one handwriting, and are not therefore the signatures of the persons whose names they profess to give. This fact very much weakens the value of the petition in my eyes.—I remain, your obedient servant, J. MANCHESTER."

The next attempt at coercing Mr. Green was only too successful. A prosecution was instituted by the "Church Association," the nominal parties to it being three persons who claimed to be parishioners, but not one of whom appears to have ever attended the church save for purposes connected with the prosecution. They were, William Dean, an ironworker; William Warrell,

a packer ; and John Hugh Worrill, a warehouseman. One of them, moreover, was stated* to have been previously sentenced to six months' hard labour for embezzling his employer's money. One had been imported into the parish for the ends of the persecuting Association : and when it was found that either he, or another, had not resided long enough to qualify him, some alteration had to be made in the terms of the representation after the legal proceedings had commenced ;† for which blunder on the part of the prosecution Mr. Green was in due course called upon to pay—as we shall see hereafter. On the other hand, Mr. Green and his congregation were thoroughly at one : so that here was a beautiful instance of public spirit coming forward in the interests of Protestantism, to compel a company of Catholics either to worship in Protestant fashion, or not to worship in the Church of England at all. Of the purity and disinterestedness of this public spirit more will have to be said anon.

The charges brought against Mr. Green were those of wearing the Eucharistic vestments, the use of the altar-lights in the celebration of the Eucharist, and the use of the mixed chalice.

It should be mentioned that either in the year before or (more probably) in this year (1878) the " Church Association " had sent a lecturer to the parish for the purpose, apparently, of stirring up opposition to Mr. Green. This worthy, although

* By the Hon. Colin Lindsay Wood, President of the English Church Union, in a letter to the *Standard*, March 28, 1882.

† Stated by Earl Beauchamp in the House of Lords, August 10, 1881.

a clergyman, maintained that, according to the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, the Absolution at Mattins and Evensong ought to be said by the people, the priest alone standing!

The representation made to the Bishop by the three aggrieved ones was made in November 1878. Nothing more, however, was done for two months, because the "Church Association" hesitated about providing security for costs. Eventually, however, the Bishop sent the case to Lord Penzance, and it was heard in due course, and judgment given by Lord Penzance on the 10th of June, 1879. The defendant had not appeared either in person or by counsel; and there was therefore before the court nothing at all save the case for the prosecution, and the evidence adduced in support of it. In ordinary criminal cases the Judge usually deems it his duty to take, to a certain extent, the part of an advocate in behalf of a prisoner who is undefended; but Lord Penzance on this occasion went out of his way to characterise the evidence as "unquestioned and unquestionable." Mr. Green afterwards declared, in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian*, that on three important points the evidence was absolutely untrue. By the judgment now pronounced, he was admonished to discontinue the practices whereof complaint had been made. This admonition he, as a faithful minister of the Church of England, disregarded. On the 9th of August, on an application made on the part of the promoters, Lord Penzance directed the issue of an order inhibiting him, in terms of the Public Worship Regulation Act, from performing any

service of the church, or otherwise officiating as a clergyman for the space of three months; and condemned him in costs. This inhibition also Mr. Green disregarded, because Lord Penzance derived his commission solely from Parliament, and had thus no authority to inflict spiritual penalties, or indeed to deal with spiritual matters at all.

In the bill of costs which Mr. Green was now called upon to pay were several items which throw some light, over and above what the reader has already, upon the characters both of the persecuting party and also of the Judge. As originally prepared, the charges against Mr. Green were drawn in the names of three persons; but one of them was not sufficiently qualified in the terms of the Public Worship Regulation Act; and Mr. Green was charged with the costs of rectifying this mistake. Again, the Diocesan Registrar had transmitted the charges at too early a date; and this error could not be remedied at a cost of less than £9 15s. 2d. Moreover, William Dean, the first nominal complainant, had undertaken the prosecution from a sense of Christian duty, and the proceedings against his rector had cost him some pain, or at least inconvenience, and other trouble. For this, then, it was right that he should have some compensation at his rector's expense; and the compensation deemed proper was 10s. besides travelling expenses, hotel-bills, and £2 10s. for loss of time. There were some other items as well in the bill of costs—items which did not reflect great credit upon Lord Penzance.

The prosecution had the face to charge Mr. Green four times over for *their own attendance upon the noble Lord at his private residence*; the object of these private interviews being to *get his Lordship's private instructions for the conduct of their case*. The total cost of these items was £3 8s. 8d.*

This bill of costs Mr. Green at first refused to pay.

* "Extracts from bills of costs from Messrs. Tebbs and Sons, Doctors' Commons. . . 1878, Feb. 3.—This matter having been referred by the provincial registrars for the decision of the Judge, attending Lord Penzance at his private residence, and afterwards elsewhere, when we were unable to see him, but made an appointment for later in the day—13s. 4d. Feb. 3.—Attending his Lordship again in the evening and long interview, when he agreed in our construction of the Act and rules, and was prepared to authorise the course we suggested; but having regard to the present difficulties of procedure under the Public Worship Regulation Act, he advised that the proceeding should be commenced *de novo*—1l. 1s. Feb. 4.—Perusing letter from Lord Penzance later in the day, that on consideration he was prepared to authorise the course we desired, and would, on our request and responsibility, write to the Diocesan Registrars to return the representation to us. Feb. 4.—Attending Lord Penzance at his residence, as we deemed it important it should not be sent to us, but returned to the Diocesan Registrar, when, after conference, he agreed to modify his directions to his registrars accordingly—13s. 4d. April 30.—Attending Lord Penzance at his residence, stating counsel's view and advice, when the Judge, though considering the notice good, agreed to adopt the course we required, and desired us again to confer with the Arches' registrar thereon—1l. 1s." With these extracts may be compared the following extract from a report in the *Times* of February 20, 1880, of a trial for murder:—"Mr. Justice Hawkins, on taking his seat, said some wicked or foolish persons had thought it necessary to write to him on the subject of the trial. They had better not let him know who they were. Anyone who wrote to a judge while a case was proceeding, on matters connected with it, was liable to be imprisoned for being guilty of a very gross contempt of court, which ought to be punished. If I have the opportunity I will punish any one who is guilty of it severely."

Persecution, however, did not complete the tactics of Mr. Green's adversaries. On the evening of the 7th of April, 1879, some persons secreted themselves in his church after the service; and as soon as the place was quiet they pulled down the ornaments of the altar, and after laying trains in the vestry to the several presses, lighted in the vestry a bonfire; in the hope, evidently, that the presses might be ignited and the church burnt down. Fortunately, however, the heap of books, which had been enlarged by the addition of the contents of the drawers, burnt out without communicating with the woodwork.*

On the 28th of February, 1880, Lord Penzance sat in his private room at the House of Lords, and settled a question about the costs in Mr. Green's case. These amounted now to £249, and that amount Lord Penzance ordered him to pay. On the 24th of July application was made for an order declaring Mr. Green to be in contempt of court for non-payment of costs; which, after taxation, amounted to £243 7s. 8d. The order was granted. On the 28th of October Lord Penzance sat again in his dressing-room at the House of Lords, when, application having apparently been made that Mr. Green might be signified in contempt, he decided to adjourn the case, on the ground that it would be well to see whether any effect would be produced upon Mr. Green by the issuing of a writ of *significavit* against Mr. Dale. Meanwhile, however, the time expired during which the *significavit* could legally be acted upon.

* *Church Times*, April 10, 1879.

On the 7th of March application was made to Mr. Bristowe, Q.C., sitting as Vice-Chancellor of the Palatine Court of Lancaster, for a writ of attachment against Mr. Green, on the ground of his disobedience to Lord Penzance's inhibition. A writ of attachment was in consequence issued, returnable to the Justices of Assize at Lancaster.* Subsequently, as it seems, Mr. Green's contempt of court was signified to the Court of Chancery, under a statute of King George III. ; † and Mr. Green was thereupon arrested on the 19th of March, and imprisoned in Lancaster Castle ; and lodged, curiously enough, by authority of the Quaker Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (the Right Hon. John Bright) in the same cell which had once been occupied by the Quaker George Fox. It was understood that his imprisonment would last until he should purge himself of contempt by expressing a willingness to obey the ruling of Lord Penzance's court. This, together with the conduct shown about the same time by a disloyal Irish sheriff, and its results, gave occasion for the following epigram :—

A Sheriff named Gray and a Parson named Green
 Were put into gaol for contemning the Queen.
 The Queen was delighted to set Gray away,
 While Green in his Lancaster prison must stay
 Until he turn traitor, or till he turns gray.

It was about the same time that Messrs. Tebbs, the agents of the "Church Association," having had instructions to distrain upon the goods of Mr.

* *Church Times* for March 11, 1881.

† 53 Geo. III. cap. 127.

Green for costs, two sheriff's officers were put in possession of St. John's rectory-house; and there these men remained, not selling the furniture (which, it was alleged, they had no legal authority to sell), but subjecting Mrs. Green and her family to intolerable annoyance. Mrs. Green had gone on her husband's arrest into a neighbouring cottage, and on one occasion she applied to one of the bailiffs at the rectory for a change of clothes for her baby, which had been ill. The bailiff said that he would apply to a higher authority, and answer was returned that she could not be permitted to remove the smallest article from the premises.

On the 30th of March application was made in the House of Lords before the Lord Chancellor for an order authorising the sale of Mr. Green's effects. The question was adjourned *sine die*; it came again before the Lord Chancellor on the 2nd of April, and was adjourned again. The Lord Chancellor, however, suggested that the parties should come to an arrangement with a view to the departure of the bailiffs; and this was acted upon, so that Mrs. Green and her family were able to return to the rectory on the 6th of April, just six weeks after the bailiffs had been put in. The same day Messrs. Justices Grove and Lindley, sitting in the Queen's Bench Division, refused a writ of *habeas corpus* on Mr. Green's behalf, and condemned him in costs.

On the 7th of May application was again made to the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords for an order to remove and sell Mr. Green's goods. In the course of the proceedings the Lord Chancellor asked why the costs were so large, the case

being undefended. He would have thought that five or ten pounds ought to have been the outside charge. His Lordship reserved judgment, but shortly afterwards announced that he felt compelled against his will to order a sale at the rectory.*

At the end of June it was stated in various London newspapers that the "Church Association" were resisting an application for the early hearing of Mr. Green's appeal to the House of Lords. Captain Palmer, the secretary of the Association, denied this; but it was repeated in the following week by Messrs. Brooks, Jenkins, and Co.† On the 23rd of July the bailiffs resumed possession of the rectory; and shortly afterwards Mrs. Green, not long after a confinement, was so frightened by one of these ruffians, whose temper was at the time the worse for liquor, that her health was seriously affected, and she did not recover for some months.

Mr. Green's appeal to the House of Lords was heard by the Lord Chancellor (the Earl of Selborne) and Lords Blackburn and Watson. The arguments occupied two days, and judgment was given on the 2nd of August, affirming the judgment of the courts below, and dismissing the appeal; without, however, condemning Mr. Green in costs.

The sale of Mr. Green's goods occupied two days, and ended on Friday, August 5th. The amount for which the distraint had originally been ordered was £242, but subsequent expenses had increased it to £450. The library contained about a thousand volumes; the furniture consisted

* *Church Times*, May 27, 1881.

† *Ib.* July 9, 1881.

mostly of presents from friends and former parishioners. The proceeds of the sale amounted to £298. The *Record*, in a leading article, expressed disapproval of the action of the "Church Association" in ordering the sale, and therein it did but express the opinion of more than one Low-Churchman. The writer of the article referred, curiously enough, to St. Paul's words, "Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" (just imagine, the poor, persecuted "Church Association" suffering for righteousness' sake and in the cause of charity!), apparently ignoring the obvious applicability of the very next words of the Apostle, "Yea, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren." But in fact, as one of their friends owned, the "Church Association" wanted the money; they had spent all, or almost all, of the £50,000 which had been subscribed for the persecution; they feared that they would not be able to pay the salaries of their officials, Messrs. Concanon, Ormiston, Potter, and Wainwright; and these considerations compelled them to become the spoilers of Mr. Green's worldly goods. They were in the position described by Tennyson's *Northern Farmer* (New Style), in the lines—

"Tis'n them as 'as munny as breäks into 'ouses an' steäls,
 Them as 'as coats to their backs an' taäkes their regular meäls,
 Noä, but it's thim as niver knaws wheer a meäl's to be 'ad.
 Taäke my word for it, Sammy, the poor in a loomp is bad."

It is a curious example of the degree to which party spirit will blind the eyes to the most self-evident truths, that a member of the council of the

“Church Association,” writing to the *Record* to vindicate the Association, described Mr. Green’s position as “not that of a martyr, but that of a scheming debtor, who first injures and then maligns his creditor,” and who “deserves no more consideration than any other malefactor who breaks his contracts and resists the law.”

Meanwhile the Prayer-book Revision Society had not been idle. And in 1880 Lord Ebury (who had brought the subject of revision before the House of Lords at a previous time), introduced a bill into the same House for altering or omitting the third rubric in the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer (“The Absolution, or Remission of Sins,” &c.), the last clause in the first exhortation to Communion (that about the benefit of absolution), the nineteenth rubric in the Communion Service (apparently that about the priest or bishop pronouncing absolution), the Absolution in the Visitation Service and its rubric, and the formulæ of Ordination and Consecration in the Ordinal. On this the *Church Times* truly remarked: “If the passages in question do not sanction the ‘system’ of which the noble Lord complains, it seems a little absurd to meddle with them; if they do, it is a great deal worse than absurd—it is a false and scandalous libel—to say that the said system is ‘alien to the doctrine and practice of the Church.’”^{*} In the following year (1881) Lord Ebury resigned the office of Chairman in the Prayer-book Revision Society’s Council; and was succeeded by the Hon. and Rev. E. V. Bligh. This gentleman had been

^{*} *Church Times*, March 12, 1880, p. 163.

a beneficed clergyman for nearly twenty years, but appears to have resigned the vicarage of Birling, in Kent, in 1875.

At the same time it began to be felt more and more that such proceedings as those in the case of Mr. Green were a great scandal to the Church; and in the beginning of 1881 the following memorial was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was called the Deans' Memorial, from its being headed with the signatures of the Deans of St. Paul's, Durham, Manchester, Worcester, and York:—

“ To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“ Your Grace has been pleased to invite those of the clergy who feel dissatisfied or alarmed at the present circumstances of the Church to state what they desire in the way of remedy. Encouraged by this invitation, we venture to submit to your Grace the following suggestions.

“ First of all, and especially, we would respectfully express our desire for a distinctly avowed policy of toleration and forbearance on the part of our ecclesiastical superiors in dealing with questions of ritual. Such a policy appears to us to be demanded alike by justice and by the best interests of religion. For justice would seem to require that unless a rigid observance of the rubrical law of the Church, or of recent interpretations of it, be equally exacted from all the parties within her pale, it should no longer be exacted from one party alone, and under circumstances which often increase the difficulty of complying with the demand. And, having regard

to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as to the equitable claims of congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances, we cannot but think that the recognised toleration of even wide diversities of ceremonial is alone consistent with the interests of true religion and with the well-being of the English Church at the present time.

“The immediate need of our Church is, in our opinion, a tolerant recognition of divergent ritual practice; but we feel bound to submit to your Grace that our present troubles are likely to recur unless the courts by which ecclesiastical causes are decided in the first instance, and on appeal, can be so constructed as to secure the conscientious obedience of clergymen who believe the constitution of the Church of Christ to be of Divine appointment, and who protest against the State’s encroachment upon rights assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament. We do not presume to enter into details upon a subject confessedly surrounded with great difficulties, but content ourselves with expressing an earnest hope that it may receive the attention of your Grace and of the Bishops of the Church of England.

“We are your Grace’s very obedient servants.”

This received 4,264 signatures. A stronger memorial was got up by Archdeacon Denison, and signed by 744 persons. On the other hand, a Low-Church memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury was got up in favour of persecution, and signed by three bishops, ten deans, ten archdeacons, five heads

of colleges, nineteen canons, ninety-six prebendaries and honorary canons, and two professors, besides other clergymen. Another memorial to the same effect was got up on the part of the laity.* Like other Low-Church memorials, it was not confined to communicants; and it was signed in several instances more than once by one and the same person. It ran thus:—

*“To the Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

“We, the undersigned, lay members of the Church of England, beg leave hereby most respectfully to express to your Grace our firm attachment to the doctrines and ceremonial established in the Church of England at the Reformation, and set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. We desire to represent to your Grace that whilst we are most anxious to maintain such reasonable latitude of opinion and practice as is not inconsistent with the teaching of the Formularies, Articles, and Homilies of the Church of England, taken in their plain grammatical sense, or with a faithful adherence to the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, as interpreted by the custom of three hundred years, we, nevertheless, feel ourselves constrained to enter our solemn and emphatic protest against the toleration within the Church of England of any doctrines or practices which favour the restoration of the Romish Mass, or any colourable imitation thereof, —any re-introduction of the Confessional—or any assumption of sacerdotal pretensions on the part of

* *Church Times*, January 26, 1883.

the clergy, in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments.” *

This memorial was signed by no more than 23,997 persons. †

Meanwhile an agitation was got up for the particular end of effecting the release of Mr. Green. In some churches—a thousand, it was said—prayers were publicly asked and offered for him. And although he was sneered at in some of the public papers, and one eminent prelate declared that his cell-door was “locked in the inside,” and Church-Association listeners upheld his imprisonment as a right thing, and a Vicar-General (Sir Edmund Beckett) published a brutal slander on Mrs. Green, and one leading Church-Associationist said to a clergyman of the Diocese of Manchester, “We can’t let Mr. Green out—just look what a lot it has cost us to put him in;” ‡ yet it began to be felt, even by those who knew least about the matter, and whose prejudices were against the sufferer, that Mr. Green’s continued imprisonment was a disgrace not only to that vile, hypocritical Association which had caused it, but to the country in general, and especially to the “Liberal” Government of Mr. Gladstone. The “Church Association” lost several members. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke of imprisonment as a thing to be deprecated; though intimating at the same time that for imprisonment deprivation would be a fit and proper substitute; this involving of course, in all cases

* *Standard*, March 10, 1881.

† *Illustrated London News*, April 9, 1881.

‡ *Church Times*, December 2, 1881.

where the victim had not enough private income for his own maintenance, and where he was not supported by his friends, starvation or the work-house. In 1882 a bill was drafted by the "Church Association," and brought into Parliament by the two Archbishops, the operation of which would have been to effect Mr. Green's release, but to commute imprisonment for deprivation. After passing the Lords, it was moved in the Commons by Mr. J. Talbot, and supported by Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir J. McKenna, and Mr. Hubbard; but opposed by the Attorney-General (Sir Henry James) and Mr. Magniac, and finally talked out.

In moving the second reading on the 9th of May, Mr. Morgan Lloyd described the bill as intended to amend the Church Discipline Act and the Public Worship Regulation Act, and to make them more effectual. It proposed, said he, to give the judge power to deprive a clerk of his benefice for contumacy, and so to avoid the scandal of keeping a man in prison for an offence against the ecclesiastical laws. Evidently the British public in general did not care very much for any wrongs which might be done to a Ritualistic clergyman.

Thus Mr. Green's imprisonment continued until the benefice became vacant—that is, in so far as an Act of Parliament alone, administered by a judge with parliamentary authority alone, could make it vacant. And even with respect to the terms of the Act itself, it was matter of controversy as to the exact date at which the vacancy was to be deemed to have occurred. Under these circumstances, suddenly, without consulting anyone, on the 28th

of October, 1882, Mr. Green resigned the benefice ; and addressed his parishioners in a letter the next day, setting forth the grounds on which he had decided on this step ; and which were :—(1) the object of saving, if possible, the appearance of his Diocesan in Lord Penzance's court, he having been informed that the Bishop intended to appear there on the 4th of November to move for Mr. Green's release. (2) The object of saving his patron, Sir Perceval Heywood, the expense of a litigation which would probably be decided against him ; for he had been informed that the Bishop was proceeding to sequester the benefice, on the assumption that it was already legally vacant ; the legality of which sequestration would, Mr. Green anticipated, be called in question by Sir Perceval, Sir Perceval having already intimated, in a speech at the October Church Congress, his intention of standing by Mr. Green. (3) A third ground for Mr. Green's resignation was the object of avoiding such a painful leave-taking of his parish as he anticipated would have to be in a very few weeks.

But however the Bishop's action might be deprecated by Mr. Green, his Lordship did apply to Lord Penzance, as he had intended, for Mr. Green's release. The "Church Association," indeed, was the only party which could legally make such an application ; and, with the malice which had characterised their proceedings from the first, they had abstained from making it. But they felt that it was of no use to press their game further ; the obloquy which they had incurred was quite enough for them ; and they now left the matter in the hands

of Lord Penzance ; who thereupon ruled that Mr. Green had expiated his contempt, and had by means of his imprisonment obeyed the monitions of the court ! The next thing in course was to order a writ of deliverance. The writ was brought the same evening (November 4) to Lancaster Castle, where Mr. Green had already been informed by telegram of the issue of the proceedings ; and on receiving the official communication he proceeded to avail himself of it, and was ere long in the bosom of his family.

CHAPTER LXIX.

Immoral Period, continued. Continued Persecution of Mr. Edwards (Baghot de la Bere) and Mr. Dale.

ON the 9th of March, 1880, a second suit was commenced against Mr. Edwards, who about this time took the name of Baghot de la Bere, and it was avowedly commenced for securing his deprivation. Information of the Bishop's having signed Letters of Request to Lord Penzance in this second suit was first received by the Vicar of Prestbury in the perusal of a paragraph in the *Rock* newspaper of Friday, the 12th of March. On his inquiring of the Bishop whether this was true, he was told by his right rev. Father in God that his Lordship was precluded from communicating with him in reference to the case *Combe v. Edwards*. In order to understand this, the reader must be informed that in an episcopal charge, delivered some time before, the Bishop had announced the

plan which he intended to follow towards such beneficed clergymen as refused to conform to his *dicta* in matters of ritual. His Lordship intended, he said, in such cases, to place the fact on record in his episcopal registry, and thereupon to break off all communication with the clergyman in question. However, Mr. De la Bere had not long to wait for the information which he had asked ; for on the 22nd, being Monday in Holy Week, he was served with an official document citing him, in consequence of the Bishop's Letters of Request, to enter an appearance, personally or by proctor, at the registry of Lord Penzance's court "on the sixth day following,"—that is to say, either on Easter Even, or, if Good Friday was not to be reckoned, then on Easter Monday. Mr. De la Bere was now charged not only with certain practices the carrying on of which was a disobedience to Lord Penzance's monition issued in the previous suit, but also with offences committed subsequently.

On the 24th of July application was made for the admission of more articles ; the new articles stating what Mr. De la Bere had done since his pretended suspension by the court. On the 20th of November the matter was brought before Lord Penzance again, and the court was prayed for a sentence of deprivation. Judgment was reserved, and delivered on the 21st of December, to the effect that the Judge was prepared to pass sentence as prayed ; as, however, the ancient practice was for the promoter of such a suit to draw up the sentence in writing, he should adjourn

the court until the 8th of January, 1881, and then declare the articles proved, and pass sentence accordingly. Which things he did, accordingly, as he had promised, declaring Mr. De la Bere guilty of contempt or contumacy, of incorrigible disobedience to the Ordinary, of incorrigible disobedience to the canons of the Church, and of failure to observe the Book of Common Prayer; and thereupon passed upon him a sentence of deprivation.

Against this sentence a rule *nisi* was moved for in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice on the 14th of January, 1881, calling upon Lord Penzance and the promoter of the suit to show cause why a writ of prohibition should not issue against the publication and confirmation of the sentence pronounced by Lord Penzance on the 8th. The Master of the Rolls (Sir George Jessel) granted the rule.

On the 5th of January, 1881, Mr. De la Bere published a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury complaining of the character of the proceedings taken against him. This letter was dated the 23rd of the preceding December. We have already quoted the account given in it of the mobbing of Prestbury Church on Passion Sunday, 1878. On the Sunday after the publication of Mr. De la Bere's letter the outrage was repeated. "On this occasion," says Mr. De la Bere, "the mob employed was a much larger one than before. They numbered several hundreds, and consisted, for the most part, of the class familiar only to myself and others here as passing through our village on occasion of race-

meetings and other similar attractions in the neighbourhood. On this occasion, the first Sunday after Epiphany of the present year, a crowd of this description poured out of the town of Cheltenham, some of its rougher elements being, as I understood at the time, especially engaged from Gloucester, and thronged the churchyard some time before the commencement of Divine Service at eleven. Happily, some suspicion of the probable reappearance of this horrible phenomenon had suggested arrangements on the part of the churchwardens and the police, as wise as they proved effectual, for the protection of the usual congregation by whom, and by whom alone, the church was permitted to be filled; and with this strange and awful environment we celebrated Divine Service. Now, it was naturally asked on this as on the former occasion, Why did these men come? and, Who sent them? They were plainly not of a class which interests itself in religious controversy, and I am very sure they did not come spontaneously. Poor fellows, I do not blame *them*. They had evidently little heart in what they were about, and were baffled by the arrangements which awaited them and frustrated apparently the purpose of their coming. They stood, and stared, and crowded, raising an occasional shout, and then, soon after the conclusion of Divine Service, they dispersed, and never came again. But I do hold deeply guilty those dastards, whoever they may be, who are responsible for the use of such dangerous weapons, and on whom the sin and the shame of this second desecration rests. I at once

sent to the *Church Times*, in a letter addressed to the Editor, a brief statement of the facts of the case, and they could hardly fail to become otherwise gradually known far beyond the immediate neighbourhood; but, so far as I am aware, no condemnation of the resort to such weapons has come as yet from any in spiritual authority over us. I desire, however, to record, with gratitude, the fact that from one Nonconformist pulpit of Cheltenham words of noble and outspoken condemnation went forth. As to any collusion which may have existed between the hidden workers who sent the mob and those almost equally hidden ones who are responsible for the prosecution, it is impossible even to surmise; but that the former acted as the auxiliaries of the latter the occasion of their action irresistibly suggests."*

Mr. Baghot de la Bere had appealed against Lord Penzance's sentence of deprivation, not on the merits of the case, but on one of the most trivial points which could possibly be raised by way of objection. Lord Penzance had pronounced the sentence while sitting in one of the committee-rooms of the House of Lords; and the validity of the sentence depended, in law, upon the assumption that the Houses of Parliament, with their committee-rooms and other premises appertaining, were not in law a royal palace. On behalf of Mr. Baghot de la Bere it was alleged that they were such a palace, and therefore exempt, like those

* *St. Mary's, Prestbury. The Attempted Deprivation of the Vicar. Being a Second Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury*, pp. 4, 5.

palaces in which the Sovereign of England resides, from the jurisdiction of the judges. The question was argued in part on the 6th of December, 1881, in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, before Mr. Justice Chitty, Sir George Jessel having been appointed to the Court of Appeal. The hearing was resumed on the 15th and continued on the 20th of March, 1882, before the Master of the Rolls (Sir William Baliol Brett, afterwards Lord Esher), Lord Justice Cotton, and Lord Justice Bowen; and these authorities concurred in pronouncing that the Houses of Parliament were not a royal palace in the sense contended, and that therefore Lord Penzance's sentence was valid. This judgment was delivered in the beginning of December 1882. Mr. De la Bere continued to deny Lord Penzance's spiritual jurisdiction *in toto*; but he deemed it best, all things considered, to resign his living at last. The patron, however, presented a clergyman of like views, who was duly instituted by the Bishop: so much did the Low-Church cause gain by unprincipled action in this case. The action fell heavily upon the individual clergyman attacked, but that was all; nor was even he altogether silenced, for he undertook a curacy at Brighton.

We will now return to Mr. Dale, who had, it will be remembered, been inhibited by Lord Penzance, but had paid no regard to the pretended spiritual sentence. On the 28th of October, 1880, the noble Lord sat in his dressing-room at the House of Lords to hear cases. In the case of Mr. Dale, application was made on behalf of the prose-

cution—that is, of the “Church Association”—that he might be signified in contempt for disobedience. The application was granted; and at about half-past seven o’clock on the following Saturday evening Mr. Dale was arrested and lodged in Holloway Prison. And in accordance with the prison regulations, with which the churchwardens, his persecutors, appear to have been not unacquainted, he had on the following day (Sunday) no food save the ordinary prison fare, and no means of communicating with his friends.

This act made many Low-Churchmen ashamed. The *Record* regarded it with the greatest possible regret. Done as it was with a view merely to getting the money, it was not, said the Editor, a course which a Christian man could consistently take in the conduct of his own private affairs, and its propriety was not increased by the fact that the loss of the money would fall, not on any individual, but on a society supported by public subscription. Messrs. Moore and Cuney, the proctors for the “Church Association,” had refused to have anything to do with the writ of *significavit*, so that a less scrupulous lawyer had to be engaged. And the Council of the Association was greatly puzzled what to do next, though (as a member of the Council was heard one day to say to a fellow-Protestant) they “had one wretch in prison, and hoped soon to have another or two.” What they desired was to attack some High-Church bishop and get him deprived of his see.* And the Rev.

* Conversation reported in the *Church Times* for November 12, 1880.

Dr. Potter, Vicar of St. Luke's, Sheffield, thus addressed the Derby working-men's branch of the Association :—" Dr. Johnson said, the plea of conscience is the best plea of the scoundrel. I ask you not to listen to the lachrymose, whining, suppliant cry, 'Poor Mr. Dale! Putting him in prison for conscience' sake!' I say, Keep him in, the old rascal, till he says he is willing to leave his church and resign his benefice. I would then be one of the first to open his prison doors, and say, Away to the Tiber, old boy." This speech was received with laughter and loud applause.*

The majority of the "Church Association" felt, no doubt, that they had committed themselves to one line, and deemed it best to put a bold face upon the matter and go straight on. Therefore, on the 28th of August, 1881, application was made to the Lord Chancellor on the part of the complainants for a sequestration attaching Mr. Dale's property for the payment of costs.† The Lord Chancellor, understanding that he had no option in the case, made the order as prayed; and the tenants on Mr. Dale's private freehold property at Orpington, in Kent, were served, in consequence, with notices to pay their rents to the sequestrators. The rents of this property had been taken from Mr. Dale the year before to liquidate some other costs. Mr. Dale and his friends were willing to pay the costs of his last prosecution, but the council of the "Church Association" rejected his offer

* *Daily Advertiser*, cited in *Church Times* for November 19, 1880.

† *Church Times*, September 16, 1881.

of doing so, preferring to recoup themselves for every shilling which they had spent in his prosecution by sequestrating his private property for the second time.* In December his costs amounted to £344 12s. 3d.

Sequestration, however, was not the only means by which the "Church Association" were able to recoup themselves. The trustees for certain charities connected with the parish of St. Vedast sent a contribution of £25 to the Association, and other similar trustees sent £50; the latter being acknowledged on the cover of the *Church Association Intelligencer* for 1878 as sent by the churchwardens of St. Michael-le-Querne. On the Vicar's inquiry of Mr. Andrews, the Chairman of the Association, the latter replied that the sums of money were sent by Mr. Horwood; and this latter worthy (who was not a member of the St. Vedast Trust) stated at a vestry meeting that the amount subscribed to the "Church Association" out of the charity funds for the prosecution of the Rector (their co-trustee) was in the accounts, was sanctioned, and they did not mean to alter it. In the *Church Association Intelligencer* for February 1880 another subscription was announced thus: "St. Vedast, churchwardens of, on behalf of the parish, £2 2s." †

In December Mr. Dale applied to the Queen's Bench Division for a writ of *habeas corpus*, on the ground that his committal to prison had been illegal; but the judges (Lord Chief Justice Cole-

* *Church Times*, October 28, 1881.

† *Ib.* March 5, 1880.

ridge, and Messrs. Justices Field and Manisty), after several days' hearing, unanimously refused to make absolute the rule, either in Mr. Dale's case or in that of Mr. Enraght, which was brought up at the same time. (Mr. Enraght was another faithful Anglican priest, of whom we shall speak hereafter, and who also had been imprisoned by the "Church Association"). This judgment was grounded on the view that what authority Lord Penzance had for judging as he had done was derived, and rightly, from the Public Worship Regulation Act alone.

On the 18th of December the Court of Appeal agreed to take bail for Mr. Dale, on his undertaking not to do any act in contravention of the sentence of inhibition. To this Mr. Dale had no difficulty in acceding, as his church was being closed for repairs. And on the 15th of January, 1881, the Lords Justices James, Brett, and Cotton, having heard the arguments on his appeal, gave judgment to the effect that both in Mr. Dale's case and in that of Mr. Enraght there had been an informality concerning the writ of *significavit*; this having been defectively issued from the Court of Queen's Bench after it had left the Petty Bag Office; and, this being so, that Mr. Dale was entitled to be discharged from that writ, and that Mr. Enraght was entitled to his rule for a *habeas corpus*, with a view to his being discharged as well.* And both priests were accordingly set at liberty.

In the May following the Bishop of London sequestered Mr. Dale's living; Mr. Dale having

* *Church Times*, January 21, 1881.

been appointed to the rectory of Sausthorpe, in Lincolnshire. And on the 5th of August Lord Penzance was prayed to make an order against Mr. Dale declaring him in contempt for not paying the costs of the proceedings against him according to Lord Penzance's monition; which costs, irrespective of those incurred in the Queen's Bench Division, had been taxed at £136 1s. 5*d.* Mr. Gunnell, of the firm of Brooks, Jenkins, and Co., appeared for Mr. Dale; who, it appears, had paid all the costs as far as his ability went, and had now exhausted his means. Lord Penzance, however, made the order as prayed by the prosecutors.

CHAPTER LXX.

Immoral Period, continued. Low-Church Promotions. Fraternalism with Dissent. Low-Church Decline. "Neo-Evangelicals." Dictation by the "Church Pastoral Aid Society." Rev. R. W. Randall refused the Pulpit of Bristol Cathedral.

"I said, My leanness, my leanness, woe unto me! the treacherous dealers have dealt treacherously; yea, the treacherous dealers have dealt very treacherously."—ISAIAH xxiv. 16.

THE return of Earl Cairns to the woolsack in 1874 was agreeably felt in the Low-Church ranks: for the noble earl was a Presbyterian, and used the ecclesiastical patronage connected with his office in the interests of that party in the Church with which Presbyterians had most sympathies. The livings of All Souls, Langham Place, St. Mary-le-Strand, and St. Olave, Jewry, were filled up with men who immediately set about undoing the work

of their High-Church predecessors. And we believe that Lord Cairns never once promoted a pronounced High-Churchman.

In the year 1880, the deanery of Salisbury being vacant, Lord Beaconsfield, who was then Premier, preferred to it the Rev. John Charles Ryle, Vicar of Stradbroke, in Suffolk. Before, however, Mr. Ryle could be installed, he received promotion to a still higher place. An endowment had been made up for a new diocese to be taken out of the Diocese of Chester, and with Liverpool for its seat; and to the bishopric of this Orange-riden town Lord Beaconsfield made haste to appoint Mr. Ryle. In this appointment, said the Treasurer of the "Church Association," Lord Beaconsfield "desired to show his sympathy—as indeed he had always shown his sympathy—with the Protestantism of the Church of England."* Mr. Ryle had taken a remarkably good degree at Oxford, but knew nothing of theology. His chief distinction arose from the tracts which had come forth from his pen by hundreds, and which were written in unusually plain and forcible English; being, in fact, models of that kind of composition, except so far as they were spoilt by the writer's self-assertion. Mr. Ryle was also a vice-president of the "Church Association;" and when, on his appointment to the Liverpool bishopric, he was obliged for appearance' sake to withdraw from the membership of the Association, he did not omit to intimate his intention of working in the interests of the Association, as he said, "in other ways."

* Speech at a meeting held in March 1880.

One is reminded of the saying of Themistocles, "May I never sit on a tribunal where my friends shall not find more favour from me than strangers."*

It was believed that in appointing Mr. Ryle to the bishopric the Earl of Beaconsfield sought to be revenged upon the High-Church party, because that party had been remiss in supporting Conservative candidates at the hustings. And certainly High-Churchmen were so displeased with the Premier for supporting the Public Worship Regulation Bill, that many of them felt precluded in conscience from voting for Conservatives at the election which followed so soon afterwards; and either voted in the "Liberal" interest, or did not vote at all.

The new bishop (who, although, as he afterwards said, he had had some hesitation about accepting the deanery, had had none at all about accepting the mitre) took that line of administration which might have been expected from his antecedents. He annoyed High-Churchmen for obeying the Prayer-book instead of what the Privy Council pretended to think was law. He wrote to the Rev. James Bell Cox, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Prince's Road, Liverpool: † "Until you tell me in writing that in future you will undertake neither to do nor to permit others to do anything in the services of your church which has been declared illegal by recent decisions of the Queen's courts of law, I cannot license another curate for you." He delayed his consent to the building of a church

* Plutarch, *Life of Aristides*.

† October 4, 1880.

the patronage of which would be in High-Church hands. When a layman of Liverpool offered to build a church in that city on condition that the Clewer Sisters should be allowed to work in the district which should be attached to it, Bishop Ryle declined the offer; * and when he went into Scotland for a holiday, he not only absented himself from Scottish Episcopal worship, but officiated like a Presbyterian minister in at least one Presbyterian kirk, and treated the Scottish Episcopal communion, as represented in the priest of the neighbourhood, with marked contempt.†

Nor were Bishop Ryle's the only instances, afforded about this time, of traitorous fraternising with antagonistic communions. In the spring of 1876 the Rev. Gordon Calthrop, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury, had offered to take part in the proceedings at laying the foundation-stone of a great meeting-house in Upper Street, Islington, this meeting-house being about to be built for the Rev. Dr. Allon, an Independent preacher of some notoriety. The Bishop of London interfered, and Mr. Calthrop did not take part in the ceremonial; but he went to the lunch which was afterwards

* *Church Times*, November 17, 1882.

† The Rev. H. St. John Howard, writing to the *Church Times* from Pitlochrie about the Episcopal Church whereof he was the incumbent, said: "The Bishop of Liverpool has been here some weeks, but I cannot discover that he has attended any service in our church, although we have five services every Sunday. He has, however, been to the two Presbyterian kirks, and yesterday preached in the Presbyterian parish kirk at Blair Athole. Shortly after his arrival here I called and left my card, lest I should seem to be lacking in courtesy to a bishop of our communion. Dr. Ryle has taken no notice whatever of my visit." The letter is dated September 11, 1882.

held, and made a speech at it.* In December 1877 a handbill was freely distributed in the town of Southsea announcing an address by the Rev. James Ormiston, Vicar of Old Hill, near Dudley, entitled "Ritualism—it dishonours Christ and dethrones the Bible." This handbill was headed "Church Association," and concluded thus:—"Persons of all denominations are cordially invited to attend to receive information on this important subject. A collection will be made for the Association." In April 1878 Archdeacon Blunt, called by the *Church Times* "a pet of the Archbishop of York," and who was Vicar of Scarborough, and the Rev. Robert Brown Borthwick, Vicar of All Saints', Falsgrave, dined with the Yorkshire Congregational Union, the season of Lent not being ended. One of the speakers on this occasion specified, as the only terms on which Nonconformists would unite with Churchpeople, the unconditional sweeping away of the Establishment, and of sacerdotal usurpation; whatever that might mean.† In December 1880 the Rev. Augustus Frederick Benwell, Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Hastings, presided at a meeting of Plymouth Brethren, when the address was given by Lord Radstock, a well-known Nonconformist; ‡ and about the same time the Rev. Forbes Edward Winslow, Rector of St. Paul's, St. Leonards, allowed a Nonconformist tradesman to put on a surplice and read lessons in church.§ In April 1881 the

* *Church Times* for May 10, 1876.

† *Ib.* April 18, 1878.

‡ *Ib.* December 17, 1880.

§ *Ib.*

President of the Chiswick branch of the "Church Association" was advertised to lay a memorial-stone of an Independent meeting-house near Turnham Green.* And in the same year Dr. Martin Clark, a Presbyterian of pronounced views, and who had informed the "Church Missionary Society" thereof, was appointed by that Society to a medical mission at Amritzar in India, with a salary of £400 per annum.† Moreover, when the Congregational Union of England and Wales held their session at Bristol, the Dean of the Cathedral and certain other Bristol clergy attended a meeting and presented an address; in which address they assured the assembled Dissenters that they recognised the work which the said Dissenters were doing in spreading the fundamental truths of God's kingdom. The Dean added a few words of his own, and closed what he called the most pleasant act in his official life by pronouncing "The Grace." (It may be remarked that this was the same Very Reverend gentleman who had married a divorced woman.) Then Canon Girdlestone (of whom more anon) suggested a hymn, and the President, Dr. Macfadyen, "engaged in prayer." The address was signed by fifty-eight persons.‡ In the following month the Earl of Shaftesbury laid the foundation-stone of an Independent meeting-house in West Kensington, saying that he knew of no difference between the faith of the Nonconformists whom he

* *Church Times*, April 29, 1881.

† *Church Review*, Jan. 13, 1882.

‡ *Church Times* for October 20, 1882; *Christian Globe*, October 19, 1882.

saw around him and his own.* Nor was such fraternising with Dissent on the part of Low-Churchmen at all a new thing. At a meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society on the 1st of May, 1867, Dr. Miller—the same who had initiated the division of services at St. Martin's, Birmingham—spoke thus: “I say boldly that I feel I would almost say a thousandfold more sympathy with a Protestant Dissenter than I do with a Ritualistic clergyman.” And in the same year, at the opening of a new organ in the Wesleyan Meeting-house, Fletcher Street, Bolton-le-Moors, Lancashire, the Rev. Henry Powell, Vicar of the parish, and Hon. Canon of Manchester, was present; likewise the Rev. Charles Hind, Incumbent of St. Paul's, and the Rev. Edmund Warbreck, Curate of Walmesley; and Mr. Bartholomew, organist at the parish church of Ludlow, performed.†

But perhaps some of the worst instances of this sort of thing were seen in connexion with Messrs. Moody and Sankey, the American revivalists. In March 1879 Mr. Ira Sankey was allowed to perform in the parish church of Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire, the rector of which was the Rev. George Hall. A platform was erected for Mr. Sankey under the chancel-arch, and an American organ placed at his disposal. The Rev. Samuel Henry Pink, and Mr. Greaves Bagshawe the churchwarden, were responsible for this scandal.‡

* *Christian World*, November 9, 1882.

† *Bolton Chronicle*, cited in *Church News*, December 18, 1867.

‡ *Guardian*, March 26, 1879, p. 416.

On Sunday, November 5, 1882, notice was given in Trinity Church, Cambridge, of a collection on the Sunday following for defraying Messrs. Moody and Sankey's expenses. And on the following Tuesday a public meeting was held in the same church—once Mr. Simeon's, and the patronage whereof had been acquired by his trustees; and those few persons who attended took it by turns to stand up in their pews, make speeches, and offer extempore prayers; the Vicar meanwhile (the Rev. John Barton) walking about among them and arranging who should speak or offer prayer next.* The president on this occasion was the Rev. Henry Nevile Sherbrooke, Minister of Portman Chapel, London, and who hailed from St. Alban's Hall, Oxford (though without a degree), and the London College of Divinity. Mr. Sankey sang several solos, and the proceedings were closed with a prayer by the Wesleyan minister.† Again, on the following Thursday Mr. Sankey not only sang a solo, but offered prayer, in the same church.‡

About this time the decline of the Low-Church party as a religious force became more marked. At the Islington clerical meeting which had been held in January 1875, there was some lamentation over the growing worldliness and inefficiency of the Low-Church clergy. In August 1878 an "Old Indian," writing to the *Record*, said: "I cannot but watch with aching heart the visible

* *Church Times*, November 10, 1882.

† *Morning Post*, November 9, 1882.

‡ *Church Times*, November 17, 1882.

decline of Protestant feeling, even among the truly pious members of our Church." From a circular issued by the directors of Exeter Hall in the summer of 1879 it appeared that the crowds which used to resort to that place of religious meetings had much diminished; and that though the small hall was too small for some of the societies which used to hold their annual meetings there, the large hall was too large. In the same year, the Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth, who had occupied the see for more than twenty years) gave in his charge a little piece of statistics, by which it appeared that the average number of communicants in his diocese was between thirteen and fourteen thousand, and that the gross number might be one-third more. The population, however, was about a million and a half; so that the number of communicants was only about one per cent. In the same year the Secretary of the Working Men's Protestant League had the impertinence to write to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral protesting against the holding of the Three Hours' Service on Good Friday.

About the same time also there was going on amongst Low-Churchmen a good deal of mutual recrimination; some complaining that their brethren were too high, and these again, that their accusers were too sweeping in their abuse of Ritualists; and it was urged in the same behalf that some doctrines, commonly deemed the exclusive possession, in the Church of England, of High-Churchmen, had been held by Low-Churchmen of a former age. How far this was true our

readers will form their own opinion ; we only note now a claim implicitly put forth by some members of the party. We have already seen that many Low-Church people had been altering their religious views so as to be classed either with High-Church people or with Broad-Church people ; and many of these, while failing to receive the Catholic faith in its integrity and with all its consequences, allowed Christian charity and common-sense to have their legitimate play, and did not forbear to mix at times with their brethren who differed from them. These excited the religious fear of the *Rock* and its adherents, and were nicknamed by them Neo-Evangelicals ; the *Rock* meanwhile claiming to be the true representative of the old Evangelicals, and inveighing strongly against those who would join with Ritualists in any religious schemes.

An instance of the same spirit, when the annual Church Congress was held at Swansea, was afforded by the "Church Pastoral Aid Society," more truly termed the Party Pastoral Dictation Society. The Rev. Eli Clarke, Vicar of Christ Church in the said town, was desirous of having special sermons preached in his church during the week of the Congress, but was unable to find a Low-Churchman to preach them. Under these circumstances, and on the suggestion of his parishioners' churchwarden, he applied to the Rev. Richard Meux Benson, Perpetual Curate of Cowley St. John, Oxford, and Superior of the Cowley Fathers, and who had been invited to speak at the Congress, and was a native of the town, and the owner of

much property in the neighbourhood. Mr. Benson consented, and Mr. Clarke's account of the result was this: "I do not think I ever heard two more eloquent, earnest, evangelical sermons; the lowest of our Evangelical Church-people, together with a large number of Nonconformists, were delighted and strengthened in their faith and love to God, and no one more so than myself." The matter, however, was reported to the Committee of the "Church Pastoral Aid Society," and "the Sub-Committee, having regard to the fact that Mr. Benson, one of the noted preachers among the Cowley Fathers, had been invited to preach" at Christ Church, recommended that the grant of £60 a year for a curate should be stopped; and the General Committee, the attendance at which was stated to have been very large, having "fully and patiently" (as they said) considered the case, and "feeling satisfied that the proceedings at Christ Church were so entirely at variance with the views of the supporters of the Church Pastoral Aid Society," confirmed the minute of the Sub-Committee, and determined that the grant should cease at the end of the current quarter—that is, on the 31st of January, 1880.

About the same time the Rev. James Alexander McMullen, Vicar of Christ Church, Cobridge, Staffordshire, felt compelled to discontinue the use in his church of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, through fear of losing his grant from the same Society: the Secretary having warned him again and again against retaining it, and the Society itself looking with suspicion on those churches

where it was found. And some time previously the Society had deprived the Vicar of St. Columb-the-Less, Cornwall, of his grant for the Church of Newquay in that parish, and apparently for no other reason than that the Vicar refused the Society's dictation as to what hymn-book should be used in his church. An emissary of the Society had declared that the Society could not sanction *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, and, on being told that the congregation could not be expected to buy themselves new hymn-books, had replied, "Our Society will make you a grant to overcome that difficulty." *

It was, of course, to be expected that a party which fraternised with Dissenters would exclude good Churchmen from the pulpit, even where, for any special reason, prosecution was not in contemplation. And a further instance hereof was afforded in 1881 by the Dean and Chapter of Bristol. Among the many charitable institutions connected with that ancient city are three societies which administer charities founded by an eminent philanthropist of the last century, Edward Colston. These societies are named the Dolphin, the Anchor, and the Grateful: the Dolphin being Conservative in politics; the Anchor, Radical; and the Grateful, not political at all. Each society keeps its own annual festival. The Dolphin not only eats a dinner, but hears a sermon, preached usually in the Cathedral, and the preacher being nominated by the President of the Society for the time being. The Dean of Bristol (the Very Rev. Gilbert

* Letter in *Church Times* of January 9, 1880.

Elliot, D.D.) having, by his marriage with a divorced woman, given great scandal, found it expedient to live in retirement; and the affairs of the Cathedral were mainly in the hands of Canon Girdlestone, a pronounced Low-Churchman, who (as we have already seen), with the Dean and certain other clergymen, went out of the way to express sympathy with Dissenters at a session of the Congregational Union. Owing to the influence, it was believed, of this dignitary chiefly (the Dean being at the time abroad), when the Rev. Richard William Randall, Vicar of All Saints', Clifton, had been appointed to preach the sermon before the Dolphin Society on the Colston Festival, the Cathedral pulpit was refused for the purpose. Mr. Randall, it must be observed, had signalised himself and his church by what was called high ritual, and Protestantism was very strong in the city of Bristol. All attempts to get the Chapter to rescind their resolution having failed, Canon Norris (whose Low-Churchmanship did not, it seems, reach to the depth of the Dean's and Canon Girdlestone's), placed the large Church of St. Mary, Redcliffe, of which he was vicar, at the disposal of the Dolphin Society for their preacher: and there, accordingly, Mr. Randall delivered his sermon. The Council of the "Church Association," however, passed a resolution thanking Canon Girdlestone for what he had done.

CHAPTER LXXI.

Immoral Period, continued. Persecution of the Rev. R. Enraght.

“They watched Him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men . . . that so they might deliver Him unto the power and authority of the governor.”—LUKE xx. 20.

WE have now to chronicle another persecution, known as the Bordesley one; and in the course of which a scandal was given which had been, up to the time when it was perpetrated, without precedent.*

In the year 1874 the Rev. Richard William Enraght had become Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley (a suburb of Birmingham), on the presentation of the Vicar of Aston, in whose patronage the living then was. Previously to the Easter of 1878 the parishioners' churchwarden was a Mr. Thomas Harris; and attempts had been repeatedly made on the part of a Mr. William Adkins to stir him up against the Vicar, on account of those Catholic practices which Mr. Enraght had continued in the church from the time of his predecessor, Dr. Oldknow. A person named Greening, too, had exerted himself to get proceedings instituted under the Public Worship Regulation Act, and had been heard to say, “It is three aggrieved parishioners that we want.”

Three aggrieved parishioners, however, were not to be found, and therefore Mr. Enraght's

* Most of the following particulars are taken from a pamphlet by the Rev. R. Enraght, entitled *My Prosecution under the Public Worship Regulation Act*, Birmingham and London, 1883.

enemies sought to avail themselves of that clause in the Act which allows proceedings to be commenced by one person, when that person is a churchwarden. And in 1878 the Easter vestry-meeting, which used to be attended by no more than half a dozen persons or so, was suddenly invaded by a number of men, several of whom were Dissenters; and by a show of hands a person named John Perkins was elected parishioners' churchwarden. A poll was immediately demanded, but on the urgent request of the Vicar, who did not wish the peace of the parish to be disturbed, no poll was taken. Perkins was in the employment of Mr. Greening, of whom we shall hear more by-and-by.

As soon as this vantage-ground had been gained, the war commenced. Certain persons formed themselves into what they called a "Parish Committee," and met together continually to arrange plans of attack. They acted in concert with the "Church Association," several of them being members of it. Nor was the membership of the "Parish Committee" confined to the Church of England: some of that Committee were Dissenters. The parish was now placarded with handbills intended to stir up the inhabitants against the Vicar. A doggerel rhyme was circulated, to the effect that Mr. Enraght's motive in exhorting to liberality at the offertory was his own personal gain; the fact being that of the money collected at the offertory he got none. Five inflammatory lectures were delivered in the parish—one by a clergyman named Wainwright, apparently

the one of Islington notoriety who allowed the letters for "Doctor of Divinity" to be appended to his name, his college being really that of St. Bees. And it would seem that this lecture was afterwards delivered by the same reverend gentleman at Wolverhampton, and occasioned the Rev. Henry Bolland, Vicar of St. James's, Wolverhampton, and Rural Dean, to write thus to the secretary of the local branch of the "Church Association:"—"I must put my charity above my Protestantism, and I cannot consent to remain any longer in a branch of the Church Association which has allowed such a lecture to be delivered as I have had to listen to this evening."*

On the 31st of May Perkins and other persons alleged to be parishioners presented to the Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Philpott) a paper of charges touching what they called illegalities in Mr. Enraght's conduct of Divine Service. These were: processions—lighted candles—the Eucharistic vestments—bowing and prostration—the service of acolytes—elevation of the consecrated elements—the use of a biretta—the eastward position (or, as the "Church Association" preferred to state it, "hiding the manual acts")—the mixed chalice—the singing of *Agnus Dei*—the signing the cross in the air—and "the sign of the cross on the Communion-table." On which charges Mr. Enraght remarked that he had never directed or sanctioned

* The above particulars are taken partly from Mr. Enraght's pamphlet specified above, and partly from a speech of Mr. Enraght's, delivered at a vestry meeting of the parish.

“prostrations” nor elevation of the consecrated elements, never worn a biretta during any service, never done anything with a view to hiding the manual acts in consecrating the elements, nor ever knelt in the Consecration-prayer. But in this part of the proceedings the least creditable share was, in our opinion, that which was borne by the Bishop; for his Lordship had welcomed Mr. Enraght to the diocese, and had held two confirmations in Holy Trinity Church, and although he knew perfectly well that Mr. Enraght was but continuing the ceremonial which he found at the church on Dr. Oldknow’s decease, yet he gave no sign of disapproval. Now, however, he required Mr. Enraght to desist from four ceremonial usages, namely, the use of lighted candles when not wanted for light, the use of the alb and chasuble, the use of the mixed chalice, and the signing the cross towards the people. This was on the 14th of June.

Mr. Enraght was unable to conform to the Bishop’s direction on the first two of these, as otherwise he would have disobeyed the order of the Prayer-book as given in the Ornaments’ Rubric. But he expressed himself ready to obey on the last two, thinking that it might come within the Bishop’s canonical jurisdiction to rule as he did in regard of them. And when the Bishop intimated that he could not accept this concession, Mr. Enraght made two further offers. He would either obey the Bishop on all four points at and after 11 o’clock on Sundays, or, if the Bishop would give him a canonical trial before himself, and so

satisfy his scruples as to obeying the decrees of what he held to be the usurped jurisdiction of a mere State-court, he promised to conform implicitly to his Lordship's judgment, pending the result of an appeal on his part to the Convocation of Canterbury.

The Bishop expressed himself unable to accept either of these proposals. Nor could he have been expected to accept the last; for if he had heard Mr. Enraght judicially, and Mr. Enraght had succeeded in making good his case, the Bishop, by giving judgment in his favour, would have acted in antagonism to the Privy Council and Lord Penzance. But when, at Easter-tide 1879, Mr. John Perkins made a representation against Mr. Enraght under the terms of the Public Worship Regulation Act, the Bishop allowed proceedings to be taken; and notified the same to Mr. Enraght on the 2nd of May. It should be observed that Mr. C. B. Cooper, a former secretary to the Birmingham branch of the "Church Association," had already written to Mr. Enraght informing him of what was intended against him in case he did not alter the ritual of his church.

As soon as this became known, certain influential Churchmen of Birmingham asked Mr. Enraght's permission to mediate between him and his enemies, in hope of a possible compromise. Mr. Enraght thereupon made a proposal which, Mr. Kynnersley (a stipendiary magistrate to whom the "Parish Committee" submitted) thought, ought to satisfy any reasonable person. What this proposal was we are not told. Mr. Enraght afterwards obtained a

personal interview with his enemies, and offered certain concessions, which were rejected.

On the 4th of July, however, the Convocation of Canterbury passed a proposed rider to the Ornaments' Rubric, according to which, if it became law, Mr. Enraght would be bound to obey the Bishop on the question of Vestments. Mr. Enraght therefore complied with the provisions of this rider; and submitted to the Bishop on all the other three points which the Bishop had specified; and, further, continued this course for sixteen months—that is to say, until the Bishop sent him a contradictory letter, when he felt unable to obey any longer.

On Mr. Enraght's compliance, the Bishop wrote to Perkins, in the hope that the latter would stop the prosecution. Perkins, however, after taking counsel with the "Church Association" and Mr. Jeune, replied that he would do nothing of the kind. He would, he said, have lost his money if he had. The fact was, that the late Vicar of Aston had sold the presentation of the living to the Aston Trustees without knowing to whom he was selling it. And the prosecution of Mr. Enraght was not only for the purpose of putting down Ritualism during his incumbency, but was the result of a conspiracy for getting into the living a clergyman nominated by the Aston Trustees. "The purpose the prosecutors have in view," wrote Mr. C. B. Cooper, "is that the way may be made open—long before three years have expired—whereby in future sound Protestant truth may be taught in the parish, which for many years has

not been the case." The Aston Trustees at this time were the Right Hon. Arthur Fitzgerald; Baron Kinnaird; the Rev. Edmund Hollond, of Benhall Lodge, near Saxmundham, Suffolk; the Rev. George Lea, of Edgbaston; Sampson S. Lloyd, Esq., of Moorhall; and the Rev. G. E. Tate, of Kippington, near Sevenoaks, Kent.

The charges brought against Mr. Enraght in the representation were those of—

Unlawful use of lighted candles.

Wearing unlawful ecclesiastical vestments known as the alb, the maniple, the chasuble, and the biretta.

Unlawfully mixing water with the sacramental wine and administering the mixture to communicants at the Lord's Supper.

Using wafer-bread instead of bread as it is usually eaten.

Unlawfully standing in the middle of the west side of the Communion-table, between the people and the Communion-table, and with his back to the people, so as to hinder them seeing him break the bread or take the cup into his hand.

Bowing and bending the knee, head, and body over the Communion-table while saying the Prayer of Consecration, instead of standing during the whole time of saying the said prayer.

Unlawfully making with an appropriate gesture of his hand the sign of the cross towards the congregation while saying the Absolution and when pronouncing the final Benediction.

Unlawfully elevating the paten, and also the cup

which had been placed on the Holy Table in an unauthorised manner.

Unlawfully permitting the hymn known as the *Agnus Dei* to be sung.

Unlawfully remaining standing while saying the Confession in the Communion-service.

Unlawfully kissing the Prayer or Service-book while officiating in the Communion-service.

Permitting processions of the choir and acolytes with banners and a cross.

And, finally, unlawfully placing a metal cross on the Communion-table or on a ledge immediately over, and appearing to be part of such Communion-table.

The prosecution evidently proceeded upon the plan of telling as many lies as possible, knowing that Mr. Enraght would not appear to refute them. In the representation there were no less than ten such lies. Mr. Enraght had disused altar-lights in deference to the Bishop. He had disused the Eucharistic vestments. He had ceased from mixing the chalice. He had never bowed the knee while saying the Prayer of Consecration. He had ceased signing the cross towards the congregation in the Communion-service. He had discontinued the singing of the *Agnus Dei* for more than a year before. He had never once kissed the Service-book. Of the charge that he had taken the eastward position "with the intention of preventing the people seeing" him break the bread and take the cup into his hand, he said, "All who know me are aware that I never hide my ministrations from anyone. The charge was false and ridiculous."

And as to that charge according to which he had “caused to be formed a procession” “without any break or interval between it and Morning Service,” “and as connected with and being the beginning of and a part of the rites and ceremonies of public worship,” he said, “This is absolutely untrue.” So also as to the cross: it had been in the position whereof complaint was made for at least five years before he became incumbent of the church. And to the shame of the Episcopal Bench it must be stated that the Bishop of Worcester was aware of most or all of this when transmitting the representation to Lord Penzance. The case came before Lord Penzance, sitting in a room of the House of Lords, on the 9th of August, 1879. Mr. Enraght did not appear, being unable to acknowledge the pretended spiritual jurisdiction of the court. Affidavits were produced as evidence in support of the charges, lies and all; and then the Judge, declaring that the facts and offences had been very clearly proved, ordered a monition to be issued against Mr. Enraght bidding him discontinue the practices specified in the representation. Mr. Enraght was also, of course, condemned in the costs.

And now it becomes our painful duty to chronicle what, we suppose, will always be known among faithful members of the Church of England as *the Bordesley Sacrilege*; just as the invitation and admission of the Unitarian Mr. Vance Smith to Communion in Westminster Abbey by Dean Stanley is known as *the Westminster Sacrilege*. One day John Perkins went into the vestry of

Holy Trinity Church, and asked the Curate to show him the bread usually consecrated in the Holy Eucharist, and administered to communicants. This the Curate declined to do. Perkins went up for Communion the same day, and received the Sacrament. Soon after another person named Taylor went up for Communion, and when the Lord's Body was administered to him under the form of wafer-bread, he secreted It, and afterwards carried It out of the Church, and sent It to those who designated themselves the "Parish Committee," with his name and address. It came out afterwards that the man had committed the shocking act under the influence of a bribe in the shape of a suit of clothes and pair of boots.* The Holy Bread was subsequently sent up to Lord Penzance's Court, and was produced, on Mr. Enraght's trial, in evidence against him.

The Low-Church party gave for some weeks no more sign than Lord Penzance had done even of bare disapproval of this sacrilege. And the Bishop of Worcester, on appeal being made to him, not only declared that he did not feel called upon to take any proceedings against the perpetrator, but also abstained from all expressions of disapproval; nor did he intimate his own condemnation

* *Church Times*, September 26, 1879. It appears also from a protest presented in May 1883 by a deputation of parishioners of Holy Trinity, at a visitation held by the Bishop of Worcester in St. Martin's Vestry, Birmingham, for the admission of churchwardens, and the drift of which protest was against the admission of Mr. William Adkins, that for the Bordesley sacrilege a committee was responsible—apparently the "Parish Committee"—of which this William Adkins was chairman.

of the act until the 11th of November following, when a large number of the clergy and laity of the Church had expressed their feelings on the subject. The first notice taken by the "Church Association" in any of its branches, so far as we have been able to learn, was in the following resolution, passed by the committee of a Birmingham branch on the 3rd of October, and communicated by their hon. secretary to the *Church Times* in a letter well entitled by the Editor of that paper, "Glorying in their Shame:"—

"The committee repudiate the idea of outrage and blasphemy charged upon the act of securing an illegal wafer for inspection, and regard it rather as one of loyalty to the Church and patriotism to the State. They rejoice in it and its results. To detect imposition, to submit to the examination and judgment of a 'minister of God,' Lord Penzance (see Rom. xiii. and xiv.), is no more impious and wrong than are the unchallenged doings of a detective police. They also rejoice in the fact of the Bishop having defended 'the honour of his Divine Master' before being moved thereto by the memorialists, and in having himself first corrected 'and then assisted others to punish the disobedient and criminous' Vicar of Bordesley. His dignified refusal of the request of the memorialists redounds to his honour. May his Lordship ever be Divinely directed!"*

We may remark here, by the way, that in the October of the following year the Bordesley sacrilege was copied in a church at Chorley, near Man-

* *Church Times*, October 10, 1879, p. 628.

chester. The offender, however, was brought up before a magistrate and fined.

We have said that that committee by which the resolution just quoted was passed was the committee of a branch of the “Church Association.” The Secretary had designated it “the Committee of the *Birmingham Working-Men’s* Branch.” That, however, appears to have been a misnomer; for the president was a clergyman, the vice-presidents were ten clergymen, one physician, and eleven others to whose names the designation “Esquire” was appended.* The Hon. Colin Lindsay Wood, President of the English Church Union, proposed to the parent Association that it should join with the Union in an indignant protest against the act of sacrilege; but after considering the matter for some three weeks, the Council replied that they were entirely ignorant of the proceedings of Taylor until after the legal proceedings had terminated, and did not therefore feel responsible for those proceedings.† This was all: no word of indignation, not a syllable of bare disapproval.

The holy and Divine Food remained “filed as an exhibit” in the registry of Lord Penzance’s court, until, after a long agitation, it was placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury by request of the proctors for the prosecution. The Archbishop thereupon carried it to his private chapel and there reverently consumed it. The “Church Association,” at a meeting of council held in December, passed a resolution that to purloin the Sacrament for the

* Letter in *Church Times*, October 17, 1879.

† *Church Times*, October 24, 1879.

purposes of a lawsuit *would be* an act of which they strongly disapproved; not, however, until by a large majority they had passed a clause exonerating Perkins from all blame. That worthy had written to the Bishop of Worcester that he did not consider a wafer to be bread at all—that is, any part of a Sacrament.

On the 28th of February, 1880, Lord Penzance sitting in his private room at the House of Lords, application was made on behalf of Mr. Enraght's prosecutor for an inhibition against Mr. Enraght for not obeying the orders of the court as previously given. The inhibition was accordingly issued, to last for the space of three months, or until he undertook to pay due respect to the monition; and Mr. Enraght was condemned in the costs of the application.

Months, however, passed away without any regard being paid by the Vicar of Holy Trinity to Lord Penzance's decrees. On the 5th of August Lord Penzance had before him the three cases of Perkins *v.* Enraght, Sergeant *v.* Dale, and Dean *v.* Green; and commented very strongly upon the irregular conduct of the prosecution in each. He could not understand, he said, why for three months and more the prosecution had shown no desire to go on with these cases, though the defendants were defying the inhibition every Sunday; and why now, all of a sudden, the prosecution pressed the cases on with such haste that the gravest irregularities had occurred in the affidavits, and in the notices to the defendants to appear in their

several cases.* Even this, however, failed, apparently, to effect conformity to the Judge's wishes. It was not till the 20th of October that, an application having apparently been made that Mr. Enraght might be signified in contempt, Lord Penzance was called upon to decide whether or not to grant the application. The noble Lord adjourned the case, on the ground that he wished to see what effect the fact of Mr. Dale's being "signified" would have upon Mr. Enraght's conduct. But on the 20th of November, application being made for sentence in the cases of Messrs. Enraght and Green, and witnesses having sworn (among other things) to having served certain notices (though one of those same witnesses subsequently admitted that he had sworn falsely), Lord Penzance pronounced both defendants contumacious and in contempt for having continued to officiate in spite of previous sentences; and he ordered that the matter be signified to her Majesty in Chancery, and that the defendants should pay the costs. And a week afterwards (November 27) Mr. Enraght was arrested in consequence, and carried off to Warwick Gaol, amidst the cheering of a multitude of sympathising parishioners and other friends. The court subsequently allowed bail, on condition of Mr. Enraght's complying with the terms of the inhibition; but this he refused.

Previously, however,—that is, on the 2nd of November,—the Bishop had written to Mr. Enraght ordering him to cease from the following practices,

* *Church Times*, August 6, 1880.

over and above the four which he had already prohibited, and which Mr. Enraght had discontinued:—The use of wafer-bread, the eastward position, change of posture in the course of the Prayer of Consecration, elevation of the paten and chalice, the singing *Agnus Dei* immediately after the Consecration, standing at the Confession in the Communion-service, and kissing the Prayer-book. Mr. Enraght in reply (November 9) asked the Bishop why he took this new course, violating the previously implied understanding between them, and why he took it only a few days before the threatened imprisonment. The Bishop answered that he wanted to induce Lord Penzance to be lenient.

Meanwhile,—that is, on the 29th of November,—seven persons, including the man Taylor, who had committed the sacrilege with respect to the Blessed Sacrament, another person of the same surname, William Adkins, William Nightingale, John Newey, and one named Jackson, these being headed by John Perkins, and terming themselves parishioners and members of the congregation of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, informed the Bishop that the Rev. Warwick Elwin, Curate of Holy Trinity, had done ten acts which they termed illegal, and asked that Mr. Elwin might be prevented from officiating. Under the circumstances, however, the Bishop declined to comply with their request.

While Mr. Enraght was in prison the English Church Union took steps to quash the proceedings which had been taken against him, by applying to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice for a writ of *habeas corpus*. In this they

were not successful; but on the case being taken to the Court of Appeal, that court, consisting of the Lord Chancellor (the Earl of Selborne) and Lords Justices Baggallay and Brett, ordered Mr. Enraght's release, on the ground of a technical informality in the writ of his committal; and Mr. Enraght was set at liberty accordingly on the 17th of January, 1881. On his arrival at Bordesley he was met at the railway-station by a large number of parishioners and other friends and sympathisers, who cheered him vigorously, and in the evening the parochial school-room was crowded with persons who had assembled to welcome him back.

The prosecutor, by the advice of the "Church Association," at once endeavoured to get Mr. Enraght committed to gaol again, and with this view application was made before Lord Penzance, sitting at the House of Lords on the 26th of March, for a fresh writ of *significavit* to declare Mr. Enraght in contempt. The English Church Union, however, lodged at the House of Lords a petition of appeal against the judgment of Lord Penzance's court, in consequence of which Lord Penzance adjourned the hearing, but received formal evidence in support of the charge of continued disobedience to his Lordship's inhibition.*

This faithful priest and brave champion of the Church's rights was not, however, to continue the pastor of the flock at Bordesley. Early in November 1882 the Bishop informed the patrons of the benefice that, inasmuch as three years had

* *Church Times*, April 1, 1881.

elapsed since the date of the monition against Mr. Enraght, which monition he had refused to obey, the benefice was now vacant, and the patrons, after some difficulty, we believe, in finding a clergyman to undertake the intrusion, presented the Rev. Alan Hunter Watts, of the London College of Divinity, and Curate of Bishop Wearmouth; who thereupon received from the Bishop what was called institution, and read himself in upon Passion Sunday, March 11, 1883; taking the opportunity to violate the rubrics of the Prayer-book in several very plain and unquestioned points. Mr. Enraght, on the other hand, on being informed by the Bishop what his Lordship had done, protested against the act as uncanonical and of no spiritual validity; but added that if his Lordship should think proper to cancel or withdraw that licence to cure of souls which he had formerly given, he, Mr. Enraght, would not refuse to submit, and on the 8th of March, three days before Mr. Watts read himself in, came to Mr. Enraght a formal document revoking his licence, and inhibiting him from performing any service of the Church, or otherwise exercising the cure of souls within the parish of Holy Trinity, Bordesley; and it was signed by that same right reverend Father in God who had in 1874 thus gratuitously expressed himself: "I have much pleasure in welcoming you to the Diocese of Worcester." Mr. Enraght kept his word and left the parish, and the triumph of the "Church Association" was complete. At a meeting in 1879 of the Birmingham branch, the Rev. G. Lea in the chair, a resolution had been passed

expressing deep thankfulness for Mr. Enraght's conviction; and we can imagine the pæans which must have resounded now that their object was fully gained, and another name added to the list of Ritualistic clergy who had left their parishes owing to the action of the "Church Association."

CHAPTER LXXII.

Immoral Period, continued. The "Church Association" at a Stand-still. Further Intolerance. Ruffianism at West Worlington. Riotous Proceedings at St. Jude's, Liverpool. Attack on the Rev. N. Y. Birkmyre. Bishop Piers Claughton joins the "Church Association." A Word for the Ritualists from Bishop Oxenden. Attacks on the Rev. G. C. Ommaney.

WE must now come back to the narration of events which took place in 1880. In that year a large pamphlet came from the pen of James Bateman, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., on *The Church Association: its Policy and Prospects*. Lamenting that the object for which the "Church Association" had been originally formed had been very imperfectly achieved, he mentioned, among the causes of this, "the lukewarmness and half-heartedness of a considerable number of the Evangelical Clergy (better known as the 'Neos') who have," he said, "shown a most reprehensible readiness to walk in the ways of Sacerdotalism." In the same year an attempt was made by the same gentleman to get the "Church Association" reorganised, with a view to greater efficiency for the promotion of its ends. And, indeed, the

Association was in some respects not progressing at all. In January 1879 an attempt had been made to form a branch at Plymouth, and had failed, only about half a dozen persons having attended what was to have been the preliminary meeting. The Vicar of Plymouth had withdrawn from the Association altogether, and his example had been followed by most of his clerical brethren in the neighbourhood—those, that is, who had been members. In the month of June, too, the tenth and final call had been made for making up the Guarantee Fund (that is, the fund to be used specially in persecution) to £50,000, and it had been requested that payment might be made before the 1st of July next ensuing. We do not know whether these were the circumstances which called forth the following burst of oratory, at a spring conference of the Association, from that same Mr. Wainwright whose lecture given at Wolverhampton in 1878 had the effect of making the Vicar of Wolverhampton withdraw, as we noted before:—“As he [Mr. Wainwright] had listened to that discussion there was a throbbing undertone in his mind, and it now took the form of the question, What were they going to do?” &c., &c.

Yet the spirit of the Association was strong and uncompromising as ever. At the spring meeting in 1880 a Mr. Lovell said that he knew no reason why a Ritualistic clergyman should not be dealt with in the same way as a pickpocket, and prosecuted under a certain Act of Elizabeth; so that for breach of a rubric (he meant, for breach of

Privy Council falsifications of the rubrics) he might be sentenced, for the first offence, to forfeit a year's profit of his benefice and be imprisoned for six months; for a second offence, be deprived and imprisoned for a year; and for a third offence, be imprisoned for life.* Nor was Low-Church intolerance confined to the "Church Association." In this same year the Richmond Board of Guardians objected to adorning of the altar-cloth in the work-house chapel with the sacred monogram, and to putting up texts of Scripture on the walls, these being considered as tending to Ritualism. And in the following year the same Board refused permission for hanging up in one of the wards a picture of the Crucifixion, given to an inmate of the union by a friend. The picture had a verse of a hymn and some other sentences roughly illuminated round it. In November the Rev. Charles Walker Molony, Rector of West Worlington, in the north of Devon, wrote to the *Church Times* † an account of the ruffianism to which he and his family had been subjected because of his having endeavoured to stop the bell-ringing which had been customary in what was called Revel Week, when there was much drunkenness even on the part of some of the ringers. Mr. Molony's fowls were stolen and killed; his wife and daughter had large stones thrown at them; his coach-house, stables, and cow-house set on fire, and a fine cow burnt to death. And he received a letter in which the writer said: "If you are one of those traitors

* *Church Times*, May 21, 1880.

† *Ib.* November 25, 1881, p. 802.

who, professing to be a Protestant clergyman [*sic*], are trying to introduce Popery [&c. &c.], then all honour to the demonstrators!"

At Liverpool also there were proceedings of a most disgraceful character. Liverpool, from its proximity to Ireland, and from being withal a principal seaport, was naturally the chief stronghold of that party of Irishmen in England which has always been peculiarly rabid in its Protestantism. In the year 1836 the Rev. Cecil Wray had been appointed to the Incumbency of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in that town, and had commenced daily Mattins and Evensong, and a celebration of the Eucharist on every Sunday and festival, and had continued this until his resignation in 1875. And for this, and although his ritual went no further than putting his choir into surplices, and, we suppose, wearing the surplice in the pulpit himself, yet he was abused and vilified by his Low-Church neighbours to a greater degree for these things than when, on the written request of his congregation, he adopted the Eucharistic vestments and other matters of Catholic ritual. He was denounced from platforms and in the Press as a traitor and a Jesuit, and every foul name in the fertile vocabulary of the Orange faction was hurled at him.* That was the time when ecclesiastical affairs in Liverpool were ruled by Dr. M'Neile,

* Mr. Macaulay (afterwards Lord Macaulay) used the following language, February 19, 1844, in his speech on the state of Ireland: "It was pleasant to hear your opponents called by every nickname that is to be found in the foul vocabulary of the Reverend Hugh M'Neile."—*Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches*, new edition, London, 1871, p. 649.

afterwards the "great and good" Dean of Ripon, and what was termed the Irish Brigade.*

In this Orange-ridden town the Rev. Ernest James Augustus Fitzroy had been appointed to the vicarage of St. James's, Hardwick Street, in 1879; and soon gave offence to his Low-Church neighbours by improving the services of his church. On Sunday, the 6th of August, 1882, there were scenes of disorder inside and outside the church. As soon as the Vicar entered the pulpit, thirty or forty persons left the church, and, quiet being restored, he gave out his text, when another batch departed, all the malcontents standing between the inner and outer door of the church, where they kept up a lively conversation during the sermon. After the sermon, reinforced by about 150 persons, they returned into the church, and, gathering under the gallery, formed a large body. The opening prayers of the Communion-service were read amidst groans and hisses, and cries of "Shame!" and "No Popery!" After the service the choir, on returning to the vestry, were hustled, and yells resounded through the sacred edifice. On emerging from the church the Vicar, Mr. Fitzroy, was hooted, and the mob cut the reins of the horse that was to take him home. In the evening order was restored by a force of police, but after the service on leaving the church the Vicar was again hooted. The Rev. E. J. A. Fitzroy telegraphed the following account of the affair:—"Yesterday there were disturbances at St. Jude's, Liverpool, almost equal to those which have occurred at St. George's-in-the-

* *Church Times*, December 27, 1878.

East and St. James's, Hatcham; with this difference, that the services which have elicited mob violence in this instance can in no sense be called Ritualistic, being simply of the same type as those in cathedrals, and the only ornaments being a cross and vases of flowers on the super-altar. Those who object to the present services, having twice invoked the interference of the Bishop of Liverpool, yesterday during the celebration of the Holy Communion, stood on the seats, shouted 'No Popery!' and during the Prayer of Consecration hissed, hooted, and laughed in the most shameful manner."*

On the night of Saturday, the 16th of September, an orange-coloured placard was posted in the neighbourhood with the following contents:—"God save Protestantism! The parishioners oppose the profanation of the services because of—first, monkish cassocks; second, a surpliced choir; third, processions; fourth, preaching in the surplice; fifth, intoning the prayers; sixth, early morning (fasting) celebration of the Lord's Supper; seventh, naming the Lord's table the 'altar' and bowing to it; eighth, a cross and flower-vases on the Lord's table; ninth, teaching the Real Presence and Baptismal Regeneration; tenth, turning to the east and bowing is [*sic*] anti-Scriptural and Papistic, and therefore likely to provoke tumult. Protestants, help in opposing the pranks until they are withdrawn." In obedience to this sensible and Christian invitation, many Low-Churchmen attended the service at St. Jude's Church on the

* *Morning Post*, Aug. 8, 1882.

following day, and gave vent within the sacred building to various disagreeable sounds; and when the Vicar and choristers proceeded down the aisle an attempt was made to stop them. A disgraceful struggle followed, and Mr. Fitzroy and the choristers took off their surplices on the spot. Several blows were aimed at him, and he warded them off as well as he could. At last, however, the police appeared, and a young man, being given into custody, was afterwards fined five pounds and costs.* A meeting of Protestants was held shortly afterwards in Kensington Fields, and one of the speakers thereat said that the bishop of the diocese (Dr. Ryle) had done more of the Devil's work than any man in Liverpool by walking in procession at St. Jude's Church when he had preached at the harvest festival there two years before.†

About the same time the Rev. Nevile Young Birkmyre, Vicar of St. Simon's, Bristol, was charged by the churchwardens with the following practices, termed by them illegal:—Hearing confessions, use of wafer-bread, use of the mixed chalice, elevating the paten and chalice, prostrating himself while saying the Prayer of Consecration, employing choristers as servers, taking the ablutions of the sacred vessels, and keeping the altar covered when there was not to be a celebration.‡ We have not heard what the result was.

We should, perhaps, have noticed that the "Church Association" received, early in 1881, the

* *Church Times*, September 22, 1882.

† *Ib.* September 29, 1882.

‡ *Ib.*

announcement of an important addition to its membership. This was in the person of the Right Reverend Dr. Piers Claughton, formerly Bishop of Colombo, and who was now combining in one the offices of Archdeacon of London, Canon of St. Paul's, and Chaplain-General to the Forces, besides acting as a suffragan bishop in the Diocese of London. The year 1880, however, had not expired before Dr. Oxenden, late Bishop of Montreal, and Metropolitan, had written a letter to the *Times* in which he said that the alleged grievances of the Ritualists had something in them, and that even that lack of loyalty with which they were charged had some excuse; and, further, that they were suffering, not for any dereliction of ministerial duty, but for a mistaken view of what that duty was. Bishop Oxenden was well known as the author of various Low-Church tracts and other publications.

We now have to chronicle a set of Low-Church attacks made upon a clergyman of Sheffield. Sheffield had long been a stronghold of the Low-Church party. The vicarage of the mother-church was in the gift of Simeon's trustees alternately with another patron; and we believe that in 1881 there was not in the town a single church where the Anglican service was conducted in a manner that any good Churchman would call decent. In 1882, however, Mr. Gladstone, as Prime Minister, appointed to the vicarage of St. Matthew's, whereof the Crown had the alternate presentation, the Rev. George Campbell Ommaney, who immediately began to make improvements; and thus, as was

to be expected, raised Low-Church rancour against himself. Some Low-Churchmen of the congregation had already copied the practice of their party at St. James's, Hatcham, in facing west at the Creeds when the clergy and choir faced east. And now Mr. Wynn, the parishioners' churchwarden, memorialised the Archbishop of York charging Mr. Ommaney with the following practices :—

1. Administering wine mixed with water at the Lord's Supper.

2. Administering wafers, or bread pressed into thin cakes as thin as a wafer, instead of the ordinary bread.

3. Standing with his back to the people, so that they cannot see him break the bread or take the cup into his hand.

4. Prostrating his body over the elements during the consecration. (It will be remembered that, according to a Privy Council ruling, prostration could be done by merely bending the knee, even without touching the ground; and how much more, then, might it be deemed capable of being done by bending the upper part of the body forward!)

5. Making the sign of the cross during the consecration of the elements. (It was not explained how the celebrant could be seen to do this, when his other manual acts could not be seen at all.)

6. Making the sign of the cross during the saying of the Creeds.

7. Elevating the wafer, paten, and cup.

8. Having the assistance of a server or acolyte.

9. Using an embroidered chalice-veil, corporal, pall,* and burse.

10. Using a white table-cover, with five small crosses worked thereon.

11. Allowing the said table-cover to remain on the table during the service when there was no celebration of the Holy Communion.

12. Ceremoniously washing and wiping the paten and cup when all have partaken.†

The Archbishop, however, refused to entertain the charges.

Nothing daunted at this rebuff, the Low-Churchman returned to the attack. A Church Mission was being held in Sheffield, and on Friday, the 27th of October, 1882, the Rev. J. Ives preached and gave an instruction, expounding in the latter the Church's teaching on Confession and Absolution. At the ten o'clock service next day Mr. Ives was about to address the congregation, when Mr. Wynn went to him and said, "I cannot allow you to take any service in the church." Some discussion followed, but at last the churchwarden, finding Mr. Ives determined to proceed, and, considering that four policemen were in attendance, deemed it best to withdraw. Nor was even this failure

* The *corporal* is a square linen cloth laid over that part of the altar whereon the sacred vessels are to be placed. The *pall* is a covering placed over the vessels while empty; and which is usually of some rich material, of the same colour as the frontal and chasuble.

† The reverent acts of rinsing out the sacred vessels and drinking the ablutions immediately after the final Benediction are in effect enjoined by the Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer; it being impossible to consume *all* of what is over and above of the consecrated gifts without the acts in question.

enough to quiet him : he must needs invite a leading member of the "Church Association"—Dr. Potter, Vicar of St. Luke's—to invade the parish of his clerical brother and give an address on the Confessional ; which address was given, accordingly, in St. Matthew's Church Schools, on Monday, the 30th of October following ; showing that even the most ordinary considerations of clerical etiquette, not to say of common decency, formed no bar, in the eyes of some Low-Churchmen, to their attacking a High-Church brother when they had opportunity of so doing.

CHAPTER LXXIII.

Immoral Period, continued. Decease of Archbishop Tait. End of the Mackonochie Case. The "Church Association" and Bishop Jackson.

"The unjust knoweth no shame."—ZEPHANIAH iii. 5.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury had been for some time in a weak state of health, and on Advent Sunday, December 3, 1882, he departed this life. Towards the end of his mortal career he had seen the folly, and had seen also, perhaps, the wickedness, of attempting to drive the Ritualists out of the Church of England. And there were not wanting, moreover, signs that he had come to a better mind in regard of some other matters with respect to which, in former times, he had shown a culpable antagonism to the principles of that Church of which he was a chief minister. Thus, when, on the last Christmas Day of his mortal

life, he had attended the principal service in the Catholic Apostolic Church in Camberwell (not, however, let us hope, without having at an earlier hour celebrated the Eucharist himself, either in his private chapel, or else in some other Anglican church), he had expressed himself afterwards as much impressed by the recital of the Athanasian Creed—of that same Creed for the neglect to recite which, at the times ordered in the Prayer-book, he had once publicly declared that he would not censure a clergyman.

One of Archbishop Tait's last official acts was to dictate, on the 10th of November, a letter to Mr. Mackonochie. In this letter his Grace disclaimed all desire of dictating to him any course of action, but suggested whether he might not feel it possible to sacrifice himself for the peace of the Church, and resign the vicarage of St. Alban's, Holborn. Mr. Mackonochie, after some hesitation, consented to act upon the Archbishop's suggestion, avowing that he had not changed his conviction as to the State courts, and did not withdraw anything which he had said or done with regard to them; but accepting the line of action indicated by the Archbishop, in simple deference to him as supreme representative of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Church's sole Head, in all things spiritual in the land, and only asking the Archbishop's good offices with the Bishop of London, that he (Mr. Mackonochie) might not be in any way hindered from being appointed to other work in the London diocese. To this the Bishop of London, on application being made to him, readily assented, being,

as he afterwards said, unwilling to defeat the Archbishop's wishes for the peace of the Church.*

The vicarage of St. Alban's, Holborn, being now vacant through Mr. Mackonochie's resignation, was offered by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's to the Rev. Robert Suckling, Vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks. Mr. Suckling was at first reluctant to accept it; but his reluctance was finally overcome, and he was duly instituted. Then the living of St. Peter's, London Docks, was offered to Mr. Mackonochie by the trustees in whom the patronage was vested, and accepted by him; and he was instituted in due course.† And thus it seemed that the vile, persecuting Association would be thoroughly and happily balked of its detestable aim; for although Mr. Mackonochie had been condemned by the State Court at its instance, yet it was generally imagined that Lord Penzance's sentence could only touch him as incumbent of St. Alban's Church; and that as soon as he ceased to be incumbent of St. Alban's, he would be, in the eye of the law, a different person from the one on whom the sentence had been passed.

Unhappily, however, matters turned out otherwise. Being moved by the "Church Association,"

* Letter to Mr. Maden Holt, Chairman of the "Church Association," dated January 4, 1883. The Bishop's words were, "If by refusing to accept Mr. Mackonochie's resignation I had defeated the late Archbishop's dying desire and effort to promote the peace of the Church, I could never have forgiven myself." The circumstances were misrepresented by the Archbishop of York in his Convocation, and the misrepresentation was exposed in the *Church Times* of May 1, 1885.

† Letter from "A Parishioner of St. Alban's, Holborn," to the *Pall Mall Gazette* for February 2, 1883.

Lord Penzance sentenced Mr. Mackonochie to be deprived of his new living. Of this proceeding the *Church Times* said: "There is no reasonable question that Lord Penzance strained and twisted instead of administering even such law as he dealt with, and that his pretended deprivation of Mr. Mackonochie, as affecting a benefice of which he was not seized during any of the proceedings against him, was null and void, and would have been reversed on appeal." *

In the same number of the *Church Times* which contained the above remark appeared the following letter from Mr. Mackonochie:—"Sir,—I shall be obliged by your insertion of the following statement in your next issue. I have been forced, by the logic of facts, to see that I ought not any longer to impoverish further a parish far too impoverished already by its own circumstances, by keeping from it the income which is due to it from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. I have therefore asked the Bishop of London to allow me to withdraw from this benefice."

The Bishop of London, on application being thus made to him, consented; Mr. Mackonochie resigned the vicarage of St. Peter's, and his resignation was accepted. Even thus, however, the "Church Association" did not secure a complete victory; for Mr. Mackonochie, being set free from St. Peter's, applied for the curacy of the same church of which he had been the first incumbent, was accepted by Mr. Suckling, and duly licensed by the Bishop, much to the joy of the congregation, and much

* *Church Times*, January 4, 1884.

also, it is to be hoped, to their edification. And it is to be observed that Mr. Suckling, on his accession to the living of St. Alban's, had restored all the ritual which Mr. Mackonochie had felt obliged to give up; so that all which the “Church Association” had gained by their sixteen years' persecution of Mr. Mackonochie was the reducing that individual priest from the *status* of an instituted incumbent to that of a licensed curate.

Nor did that amiable and respectable Society fail to manifest a sense of the fact. The report for 1883, presented at the annual meeting held in the following year, did indeed profess to be put forth “with thanksgiving to the Father of mercies;” but it immediately proceeded to give the following explanation:—“Thanksgiving, that in the midst of many depressing circumstances, in days when evils are besetting the Church from the two opposite quarters of Superstition and Rationalism, the patience and long-suffering of God are so manifest, and that so much activity is still exhibited in efforts to stem the tide which threatens to overwhelm the old landmarks in Church and State.” And then followed a lengthened wail over the continued existence of Ritualists in the Church of England, the persistence of Ritualists in claiming their rights, the spread of the principle of Congregationalism, and the detestation with which the “Church Association” was regarded.

That this was the manner in which the “Church Association” was coming to be regarded more and more is certain; “We are hated” was the complaint made at more than one meeting. And they

were doing their best to make themselves hated in that quarter where most it behoved them to secure a favourable understanding—even on the Episcopal Bench. Not only were members of the Association continually abusing the bishops at public meetings for not taking more vigorous or more summary measures against the Ritualists; but when, on Mr. Mackonochie's vacating the vicarage of St. Peter's, the Bishop of London instituted the Rev. L. S. Wainwright as his successor, the "Church Association" thought proper to lecture his Lordship in these terms:—"I beg leave to remind you that Mr. Wainwright was curate to Mr. Lowder, Mr. Suckling, and Mr. Mackonochie, who, in succession, habitually disobeyed the law; and that he took part in the illegal practices at St. Peter's, which led to two formal presentments and a representation being addressed to your Lordship; also, that the episcopal veto alone prevented the parishioners of St. Peter's obtaining redress in regard to these illegal services. Moreover, special remonstrances were addressed to you when, after Mr. Mackonochie's deprivation, and whilst the charge of the parish devolved upon your Lordship, you permitted Mr. Wainwright to carry on such illegal services. Hence it is impossible to assume that your Lordship is ignorant of Mr. Wainwright's unfitness for the office of vicar.

* * * * *

"Another question which I am directed to bring before your Lordship is the 'general permission' you have lately given to Mr. Mackonochie to officiate anywhere in the diocese. It is difficult to

understand how it can be consistent for a bishop, who 'is a minister of the law,' to license a clergyman whose lawlessness has necessitated the institution, with the Bishop's approval, of three successive suits against him. . . . I would, in your own words, respectfully ask your Lordship to consider how it can be 'consistent . . . with any conceivable theory of the discipline of an Episcopal Church,' that, under cover of your permission, Mr. Mackonochie should have special opportunities of repeating throughout this diocese the very offences which it was the object of these suits to put down, and which have resulted in his recent deprivation for contempt of court.

"This contempt has been deliberately continued up to a very recent date; and, so far as the public are aware, has neither been rebuked by you nor purged by Mackonochie [*sic*]. Under these circumstances your Lordship's action in granting the permission to officiate appears to indicate an approval of Mr. Mackonochie's contemptuous treatment of the laws and regularly constituted courts of the realm.

"I am directed most respectfully to ask your Lordship to give the diocese, and to the Church at large, some explanation of your Lordship's action in this case, which, without it, appears to the public anomalous and inexplicable, and in any event to involve issues of grave importance."*

We think that it speaks for the Bishop's forbearing courtesy that the only rebuke which he

* Letter from the Chairman, published in the "Church Association's" Report for 1883, pp. 44, &c.

administered to the Association for this piece of arrogant impertinence was conveyed in the following words:—"With all due respect to you, sir, and to the other members of the Association over which you preside, I cannot, with due regard to the office I hold, admit any responsibility to the Church Association as representing the Church of England." *

The Association rejoined; pretending that it had not asserted any claim to seek an explanation of the Bishop's conduct for itself, but for the Church at large; as if the Church of England had authorised the Association to speak or act for it!

In the bitter disappointment which the Association and its sympathisers were experiencing at the *fiasco* which they had attained in Mr. Mackonochie's resignation of St. Alban's, his being succeeded by Mr. Suckling, and Mr. Suckling's being succeeded at St. Peter's by Mr. Mackonochie, it is not matter for wonder if some of them thought that there had been unfair conduct somewhere or other. Thus, the *Rock*, commenting upon the circumstances, and upon Archbishop Tait's letter which had led to them, said: "The most disgraceful feature in the affair is the mean and unworthy advantage taken of the good Archbishop on his dying bed, it may be said, to lend the sanction of his name and office at such a time to the jesuitical device." And Mr. Martin Tupper wrote to the same paper: "The fraud has been managed by the shrewd device of making one who is no more

* "Church Association's" Report for 1883, p. 46.

alive now to deny the probable falsehood, to have recommended it as a dying request." The true state of the case, however, was as we have said above.

CHAPTER LXXIV.

General state of the Low-Church Party. The "Church Association" discredited. Bad Traits. Bad Account given in *Christian Observer*. Ministerial Inefficiency. Proceedings in Low-Church Places of Worship. Private Offices. Missionary Zeal. Workers. Ignorance in the Clergy. Hymnals—Kemble's, Mercer's. False Doctrine. Low-Church Interpretations of Rubrics. Persons preferred to Principles. Losses from Low-Church Ranks.

OF the general state of the Low-Church party at and about the time whereto in the course of these ANNALS we have now been brought down it is not necessary to say much. The greater part of the intolerance and fanaticism of the party was to be found in the "Church Association." The character of that Society was now more generally understood than it had been; and when we say character, we mean the relations borne by its practice to the principles of New Testament morality. Thus, while some who had formally withdrawn from it appear to have come back about this time, probably because they did not now expect to be implicated in any direct acts of persecution, yet in the main the Association had a very large share of general discredit. While rejoicing that some who erewhile left the work had since returned to it,* the Association was still exercised with the

* Report for 1883 (published in 1884), p. 34.

thought why a younger and more ardent generation were not ready to follow in the footsteps of their forefathers. Only six new branches had been formed in the year 1883. Moreover, the impertinence which the Association had displayed towards the Bishop of London, and which we described in our last chapter, was not the only proceeding by which it might have made enemies to itself among the occupants of the Episcopal Bench. In the same report to which in a note we have just referred, the remarks were made: "The Bishops themselves generally omit to enforce the law, and now generally refuse to allow the law to be enforced by parishioners;" "The Bishops are directly responsible for what the *Quarterly Reviewer* designates 'the anarchy and confusion under which we are now suffering.'" The report then proceeded: "It is needless to enter into details, but various circumstances have necessitated an inquiry, which is being conducted with the utmost care, how the law can be enforced against offending bishops. When the best means of trying such offenders is made clear, there will, if needful, be an early trial."* Such announcements as this were not likely to commend the Association to episcopal good-will.

Moreover, the Association and its sympathisers had not ceased to manifest the same bad traits which we have so often had to notice in these pages. There was the same readiness to bear false witness against a neighbour, there was the same

* Report for 1883 (published in 1884), p. 50.

dishonesty in argument, there was the same arrogant intolerance. Thus, in 1879, the Editor of the *Rock* charged the Rev. Maxwell M. Ben-Oliel with sowing the seeds of Popery in two gentlemen who had seceded to the Roman communion. Both those gentlemen wrote to the *Rock* contradicting the statement; but the Editor, though acknowledging the receipt of the letters, refused to insert them. The Rev. J. C. Ryle, afterwards Bishop of Liverpool, quoted, in a tract on Confession, Joshua's words to Achan as against the necessity of making confession to man, "Joshua said unto Achan, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the LORD God of Israel, and make confession unto Him." The remainder of the verse this reverend and honest controversialist omitted:—"and tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me."* A regular lay-communicant at St. John's, Birkenhead, was accustomed either to genuflect or to bow low when approaching the altar. One Sunday, when he had come up for Communion, and, after making his accustomed gesture of reverence, was kneeling at the altar-rails, the Incumbent, the Rev. William Rowe Jolley, came to him and said in a loud tone, "This is not for adoration, so I must ask you to withdraw." He then turned to one of the sidesmen and directed him to remove the too reverent offender.† The same clergyman, when, in consequence of a notice given by him, a lay-parishioner had sent in a formal notice of intention to communicate on the following Sunday,

* Joshua vii. 19. See page 9 of the *Tract*.

† *Church Times*, July 26, 1878.

demanded "an undertaking in writing that he proposed to communicate strictly in accordance with the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and would not observe [*sic*] any act not prescribed in the rubrics of the Communion-Office." An attempt was made, at a meeting of the Rochester Diocesan Council on the 28th of November, 1881, to exclude from receiving grants of diocesan funds all clergymen who did anything forbidden by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council or by Lord Penzance. Happily, however, it failed. We do not know whether what we are now going to mention was a hoax, but in September 1879 the Editor of the *Rock* inserted a letter from a "True Protestant," advocating a short Act of Parliament which should empower magistrates to fine, and, for the second and other offences, to imprison, any person making the sign of the cross. As to "Church Association" lecturers, they sometimes offered to answer questions at the close of the lecture, but found it convenient afterwards to break their word.*

There was the same ignorant abuse of everything done by a High-Churchman and which a Low-Churchman did not understand. The Earl of Shaftesbury once told a story about a visit paid by a friend of his to a village in which, owing to the shifting of the population, it had been found necessary to build a new church; without, however, pulling down the old one. Lord Shaftesbury's

* *E.g.* in the case of a lecture delivered by the Rev. James Ormiston, in the Moseley Road Board School, Dudley, March 1, 1880. See *Church Times*, March 12, 1880.

friend asked the clergyman's wife what was the use of the old church where there were no people to attend it. “Oh,” replied she, “that church is not wanted for worship; it is simply wanted for intercession. My husband goes periodically to it, closes the doors, and offers a prayer for the parish.” The clergyman was described as a man of “great ability, piety, and learning.” The noble Earl, however, in telling the story, remarked, “Well now, I say that is idolatry—downright idolatry.”*

As an illustration of the utter inability of Low-Churchmen to imagine that anybody could have reasons for thinking differently from themselves, we may cite the following letter, addressed (we believe) to the Editor of the *Record* towards the end of 1882:—

“Sir,—I believe that when a clergyman is presented to a living he sends to the bishop a testimonial, signed by three beneficed clergymen, stating that they believe the applicant to have taught nothing ‘contrary to the doctrine and discipline’ of the Church of England. The bishop of those three clergymen (if they are all in his diocese) has also to certify that those three signatories are ‘worthy of credit.’

“How could three clergymen sign Mr. Mackonochie's testimonial, when he for years has been acting ‘contrary to the doctrine and discipline’ of the Church of England? And how could any bishop say those clergymen were ‘worthy of credit,’ when he must have known, from the decisions of the law-

* *Church Times*, May 13, 1881.

courts, that the signatures were given in contradiction to the facts of the case?

“INQUIRER.

“Dec. 18.”

In the *Christian Observer* for 1873 appeared an article *On the Present Position of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England*. Most, if not all, of that article might, we apprehend, have been reproduced at the period of which we now write, and in reference to which period the “Church Pastoral Aid Society” said in its report, “There can be no question that these are days when not only the Church of England, but the Evangelical section of it, are on their trial.”* The author hinted that people of his party heard from the pulpit “too often but the stereotyped discourse of a man of little culture and less spiritual experience; perhaps the *petit possible* of one fresh from a pass examination at the University or the Theological College, the substance of whose sermon is, and will be, from year to year the same, whatever be the text; or perhaps, as old John Newton used to say, ‘a dish of mere *bones*—neither milk nor strong meat’—dry, languid, uninteresting, or disputatious, hard, and scolding; or else an ocean of words with one drop of understanding—an affected fervency with abundance of ‘Ah! brethren’ and ‘Oh! brethren,’ to give a garnish apparently to the empty platitudes which begin nowhere and end in nothing.”† As to the extent of a general missionary spirit in the

* Report for 1883, p. 24.

† *Christian Observer*, 1873, p. 88. How a thing which has an existence could begin nowhere, and end in nothing, is not very clear.

party, the author of the article quoted the words of the Rev. Henry Venn in 1865 as being equally true in 1873: "The Evangelical clergy are increased in London *tenfold* since I first entered Orders as curate of a city church, but the funds of the Church Missionary Society scarcely fourfold."* Contemplating the supply of young clergy for home needs, he noted that too many of the rising generation were "*negatively* Evangelical only," and their preaching as containing "no elements of an exceptional kind at all; it is smooth, commonplace, general, well rounded, uncontroversial, safe. But it does no good: it leaves men as it finds them."†

It was a sign of the decay of Low-Church prestige that ultra-Low-Churchmen did not always desire to be so accounted. The head of an important Low-Church educational establishment was very eager in deprecating, to the present writer, the idea that the institution under his rule was to be regarded as imbued with the principles professed by Orangemen and members of the "Church Association;" the fact being that some at least of its original promoters had been connected with the Church Association, and that he was himself examining chaplain to a notorious persecuting bishop, and had a hand afterwards in publishing a kind of protest against toleration of Ritualists.

Inefficiency in general ministerial work was evidenced by the insertion in the *Record* of a letter in which the writer expressed much displeasure at a set of questions issued by the Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan), in view of his primary visitation,

* *Christian Observer*, 1873, p. 89.

† *Ib.* pp. 89, 90.

and which were calculated to elicit the amount of ministerial work which was being done by the clergy of the diocese.

The proceedings in a Low-Church place of worship were much the same as they had been half a century before.* In a few churches, where there was a body of singers well trained in music, the Psalms as well as the Canticles might be sung to Anglican chants, and the responses also might be rendered musically; an anthem, moreover, might be performed with more or less frequency. But monotony was for the most part or altogether eschewed on the part of the clergyman. On Low-Church hymnals we shall touch by-and-by. The Holy Eucharist was never celebrated chorally. The preacher generally wore a black gown when delivering his sermon, and dismissed the bulk of the congregation with a collect and benediction, or (when there was a celebration) with a benedictory prayer; one of the plainest rubrics † in the Prayer-book being thus wholly ignored, and (in case of a celebration) one of the plainest canons.‡ When officiating in a surplice, the clergyman generally

* The Rev. Daniel Wilson, who had been Vicar of Islington ever since 1832, told the Ritual Commissioners in 1867, "I believe no changes have taken place in the mode of conducting public worship in the parish of Islington for 100 years, or for 95 years at least."—*Minutes*, in First Report, p. 3.

† "Upon the Sundays and other holy-days (if there be no Communion) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the general Prayer [for the Whole State of Christ's Church militant here in earth], together with one or more of these Collects last before rehearsed, concluding with the Blessing."

‡ Canon XVIII. prescribes:—"None, either man, woman, or child, shall . . . depart out of the church during the time of service or sermon, without some urgent and reasonable cause."

wore a black silk scarf, whether he were a dignitary, or a chaplain to some nobleman, or whether he were not; and deacons wore their scarves over both shoulders like priests. And we have heard a Low-Church deacon pronounce benediction in the same form prescribed for use by a priest or bishop. In the Holy Eucharist, the elements were placed upon the Holy Table not (as the Prayer-book prescribes) by the celebrant after the oblation of the alms and before the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church, but by the clerk or other official before the commencement of Mattins. The elements were commonly distributed to whole railfuls at once; and what of the consecrated elements might remain over and above was disposed of with irreverence varying in degree; for the rinsing out of the vessels and the drinking of the ablutions was considered a piece of Popery, to be abhorred by all faithful Protestants. Evening Communion in towns was almost universal, though not to the exclusion of celebrations in the forenoon; and we have known an instance in which the superabundance of the elements consecrated at midday were left on the altar for the evening celebration, to undergo, we believe, the sacrilegious form of a second consecration.

Baptism was seldom or never administered in the public service. And when it had been administered, care was not always taken to drain the font; so that the prayer "Sanctify this water" might be said two or more times over the same water. Such an unmeaning profanity was justified to the writer by a Low-Church incumbent on the

ground that we pray continually that we ourselves may be sanctified! as if there had been any analogy between the consecration of an inanimate element, an act done once for all, and the sanctification which, having respect to the moral and spiritual character of a person, is necessarily progressive. At a communion of the sick the priest officiated in his ordinary habiliments; and so also at a private baptism. Functions might take place in the church; involving little use for a Prayer-book, or (maybe) none at all. Such a function was once witnessed by ourselves; it consisted of a few prayers from the Prayer-book (one of them enlarged with some extempore clauses), a short lesson from the New Testament, interlarded with twaddle of the baldest character conceivable, and a hymn or two; this being the prelude to a lecture delivered from the reading-desk, and illustrated by means of a map suspended from the pulpit-cushion. On the occasion in question no ecclesiastical vestment of any kind was worn by either incumbent or lecturer.

Of missionary zeal there was what we should call a fair appearance; though, as we have seen, not enough to satisfy all earnest Low-Churchmen. Of the "Church Missionary Society," indeed, the ordinary receipts had been stationary or nearly so; but the non-advancement in this, as in the cases of other Low-Church societies, was probably due to the deadness of trade and the depression of agriculture. The "Church Pastoral Aid Society" had had to diminish its number of grants every year

since 1877. Now, however, that portion of its income which arose from donations and subscriptions was £1,481 6s. 6d. in excess above the corresponding portion in the year before, and the Society was thus able to increase its number of grants by twenty-eight. The Colonial and Continental Church Society had had an increase of "Home Income" to the amount of £265 12s. 6d. above that of the previous year. The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was the only Low-Church Mission Society which did not seem to prosper: the last account of its General Fund had closed with an adverse balance of £5,430 12s. 7d. But even that Society had had an increase, during the year to which that amount belonged, of £1,040, in the shape of contributions from auxiliary associations, exclusive of legacies.

As to workers, the Colonial and Continental Church Society employed eighteen clergymen, irrespective of such as served as chaplains on the Continent for short periods of time. The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews had thirty-six stations and twenty-six missionary clergy. The "Church Pastoral Aid Society," on the 31st of March, 1883, was providing stipends, either wholly or partially, for 570 clergymen and 166 lay-assistants; while the "Church Missionary Society," on the 1st of June, 1884, had no less than 216 stations, 239 missionary clergymen (Europeans, Eurasians, &c.), 246 native missionary clergy, and 40,757 communicants. To that

question, however, “Thou which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?”*—one which should ever be before the minds of those who undertake the responsibilities either of ordinary pastoral work or of mission-work—we are afraid that a satisfactory answer could not always be given at this time by Low-Church missionaries. Certainly, we find the Secretary of the “Church Missionary Society” addressing some missionaries in the year 1871 with respect to those sent out before by the same Society, and in these terms:—“What numbers have failed to impress the heathen with the beauty of holiness, through their unsubdued carnal infirmities!” †

If we turn to remark upon ignorance of theology as shown by Low-Churchmen, we may note, as an illustration, how the same secretary, the Rev. Henry Venn, who had been Fellow of a college in Cambridge, could cite a passage in the Nicene Creed thus:—“I believe in the Holy Ghost, the *Author* and Giver of life;” thus showing that he had forgotten, if he had ever read, that Creed in the original language.‡ Also, how the Rev. H. E. Fox, Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster, said at an annual meeting of the Irish Church Mission Society, that he had put this question to the children in one of the Society’s

* Rom. ii. 21.

† Knight’s *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn, B.D.*, p. 364.

‡ *Ib.* p. 365. The original words are, τὸ Κύριον καὶ τὸ ζῶσποιον: where τὸ Κύριον is an assertion that to the Holy Ghost belongs the title Κύριος, that title being in this case equivalent to the Hebrew Most Sacred Name. It has nothing to do with *life*, but expresses the Spirit’s eternal and illimitable divinity.

Dublin Homes: "If somebody were to come in and tell you that you ought to pray to the Virgin Mary, because she was our Blessed Lord's mother, and because children ought to listen to their mother sooner than to anyone else, what answer should you give?" Instantly (continued he) a bright-faced little girl said, "I should say that she was the mother of our Lord's human nature and not of His Divine nature." Mr. Fox noted this without a word of comment on its inaccuracy.* And as to misapplication of Scripture, we find the expression "the midnight cry" used by Mr. Venn's biographer in reference to death!†

As to hymnals, those most popular with Low-Church congregations appear to have been Kemble's‡ and Mercer's. The Rev. Charles Kemble was Rector of Bath and Prebendary of Wells; the Rev. William Mercer was Incumbent of St. George's, Sheffield. In both their hymnals the failure of Low-Church people to appreciate the Church's seasons was very apparent; and the remark applies more particularly to Kemble's. Hymns, indeed, were appointed by Kemble for all the holy-days for which special epistles and gospels were found in the Prayer-book; but the appropriations were in several cases strikingly insufficient. Thus, for the Circumcision, the hymn

* The meeting was held May 9, 1882. The truth whereof Mr. Fox failed to know the true expression is that the Blessed Virgin was the mother of the *Eternal Son* in His human nature.

† Knight's *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn, B.D.*, p. 370. The reader of the New Testament ought not to need being told that the expression in Matt. xxv. 6 refers to the Lord's Second Coming.

‡ *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns arranged for the Public Services of the Church of England.*

“How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds” was divided into two, of three stanzas each; and there was no other hymn at all which bore upon the event of the day. To Ash Wednesday there were appointed four hymns, but two of these had more the character of praise than of humiliation. For Maundy Thursday there was no hymn about the Holy Eucharist. For Ascension-Day we had seven hymns, but the first three had nothing in them which was appropriate to that day especially. For Trinity Sunday the first hymn was “Come, let us join our cheerful songs;” and for the Feast of the Presentation the hymn appointed was suitable for Christmas-tide in general; but (if we except the allusion in the third stanza to Simeon’s words, “A sign which shall be spoken against”*) had no special bearing upon the event commemorated upon the day in question; rather, indeed, the contrary, owing to the line “See, He lies in yonder manger.” Nor was there any hymn suitable for the baptism of an adult. And a hymn beginning, “Come, dear Lord, Thyself reveal,” was appointed for use at the close of public worship rather than at its commencement.

There was, moreover, in Kemble’s book a certain amount of doctrine which was at least questionable. Thus, in one hymn on the Passion occurred a line declaring that the Lord “met His Father’s anger.” † There was the hymn, “All hail the

* “Though an object of derision,
Though the theme of human scorn.”

† Hymn 135, beginning “The Lord of might, from Sinai’s brow.”

power of Jesu's Name," with its repeated invitation to "Crown Him Lord of all," contradicting His express declaration that He received honour from none but the Father.* In one of the hymns on the Ascension † were the lines

"The powers of hell are captive led,
Dragged to the portals of the sky,"

this being, no doubt, owing to a misunderstanding of Psalm lxviii. 18, where "captivity" means simply *a band of captives*; the reference being, doubtless, to those saints who were made partakers of the Lord's resurrection shortly after His resurrection had taken place, as mentioned in St. Matthew.‡ There was expressed the pagan notion of full blessedness immediately after death, and independently of the Resurrection, in the hymn "In vain our fancy strives to paint." There was Judaistic Sabbatarianism in the hymns commencing "Again returns the day of holy rest," "Another six days' work is done," "This is the day the Lord hath made." And there were some curious evidences of misunderstanding what ought to have been plain. Thus, a hymn for Trinity Sunday was given thus: "Father of heaven," &c.; as if the first verse in the Litany (from which the expression was evidently meant to be borrowed) had been, in Latin, "Pater cœlorum"

* John v. 41, viii. 54.

† Hymn 211, beginning "Our Lord is risen from the dead."

‡ "The graves were opened; and many bodies of saints which slept arose and came out of the graves after His resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."—Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.

instead of "Pater de cœlis." More strangely still, another hymn commenced "The Lord of *Sabbath* let us praise:" an error which recalls the words at the beginning of a prayer by Bishop Blomfield of London, "O Lord God of *the Sabbath*" * —it being apparently forgotten that *Sabbath* and *Sabaoth* have different significations. And in ignorant acquiescence in a nonsensical translation of Hebrews xi. 1, † another hymn was made to begin :

"Faith is the brightest *evidence*
Of things beyond our sight."

Mercer's *Church Psalter and Hymn Book* (we do not know why it was not called simply *Hymn Book*, as there was no Psalter in it) was, on the whole, we think, superior to Kemble's book. The hymns for the holy-days had more frequently some appropriateness; the ancient Catholic hymns were not shunned as much as Kemble had shunned them; one hymn for Holy Baptism expressed Catholic doctrine very well, in the lines

"Lord, may the inward grace abound
Through Thine appointed outward sign."

And Dean Alford's Harvest Hymn, "Come, ye thankful people, come," was printed, we believe, correctly, and not as travestied in *Hymns Ancient*

* *Family Prayers for a Fortnight.* S.P.C.K.

† "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." A more correct rendering (though, alas, scarcely more intelligible to the uneducated reader) would be, "Faith is the subjective realisation of things hoped for, the conviction concerning things not seen."

*and Modern.** Several, however, of the instances noticed in Kemble's book, of hymns containing false doctrine, were found in Mercer's book also. There was an unworthy condescension to Protestant ill-feeling towards the Blessed *Theotokos*,† in the alteration of the line "Jesu, Son of Mary, hear" into "Jesu, born of woman, hear."‡ One hymn seemed to teach the Methodist doctrine of perfection before the Resurrection, in the line, "And I shall sin no more."§ An erroneous substitution of the subjective for the objective appeared in the hymn

"O Sun of Righteousness, arise
With healing in thy wing!
To my diseased, my fainting soul
Life and salvation bring."

A confusion between faith and hope appeared in the lines

"Let the sweet *hope* that Thou art mine
My life and death attend." ||

Many hymns, too, in both collections were utterly unfit for congregational use, being merely descriptions of individual feelings, and pious expressions thereupon.

With all the ignorance of theology noticed above, it cannot be a matter for surprise that Low-

* Dean Alford's Harvest Hymn is correctly given in the Hymn-book also of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

† We prefer to use this Greek term, signifying "God-bearer," rather than that by which it is sometimes rendered, "Mother of God," as the latter is liable to misapprehension.

‡ In Hymn 79, "When our heads are bowed with woe."

§ Hymn 380, beginning "Jesu, Redeemer, Saviour, Lord."

|| Hymn 270, beginning "Father, whate'er of earthly bliss."

Churchmen should hold a great deal of false doctrine, independently of the Zuinglian heresy so commonly maintained. The Incarnation was denied as the central point of the Christian's faith; and, of course, most, if not all, of its practical bearings were lost. Fancy a member of the Church of England writing such a sentence as this—"That He took my nature, indeed, is everything to me, for otherwise He could not be my Saviour; but *it is not as man that I now care to be related to Him*: such relationship even Judas had!"* Of course, with such a theology, there was a denial, to a great extent, of "corporate Christianity;" † and "Irvingism" and "Tractarianism" were spoken of as unquestionably more dangerous than the opinions of "Plymouth Brethren." ‡ Though, on the other hand, the following passage from a Plymouthite work was specified as containing a teaching not only new but untrue:—"What constitutes the Church . . . is the actual living unity with Christ and with each of those who, since Christ's resurrection, are formed into this unity by the Holy Ghost come down from heaven. Was there anything like this in Old Testament times?" § Those who remember what we noted in a former chapter concerning the teaching of Cranmer and other Zuinglian divines as to the difference between the Mosaic Dispensation and the Christian, will recognise the Low-Church opinion thus expressed

* *Christian Observer* for 1855, p. 506. It is fair to add that the article in which the passage quoted is to be found was criticised in a later number, and the expression quoted as objectionable.

† See *Ib.* for 1862, p. 572.

‡ *Ib.* p. 433.

§ *Ib.* p. 573.

in antagonism to the orthodox one of the Plymouth Brethren as quite of a piece with the false teaching of their Zuinglian predecessors.

Of course, where the Church's general religious system was not received, it is not strange that Low-Church interpretations of rubrics should have been not a little curious. Thus we find in the *Christian Observer* for 1867 the idea that the Communion-table ought, for a celebration, to be brought out facing the congregation (we suppose the meaning to have been, "into the middle of the choir," or, "into the upper part of the nave"), and that the celebrant ought to stand behind it.* The phrase in the Ornaments' Rubric, "at all times of their ministration," was held to exclude the time of the sermon,† though the sermon, according to Low-Churchmen, was the chief ministration. And it was gravely maintained that the words "Let us pray," followed, in the Visitation of the Sick, by a prayer *for* the sick person, presumed the presence of a third person besides the minister and the sick person; so that a confession of sin, if made, would not be an auricular confession, but be of the nature of a public one!‡ The idea, too, was largely propagated, and very generally acted upon by Low-Churchmen, that the words

* *Christian Observer* for 1867, p. 327.

† This was maintained to the writer by a Low-Church acquaintance.

‡ The discovery was made by Dean M Neile, in 1877, and perpetuated by the Rev. Talbot Greaves, Rector of Melcombe Regis Dorset, and afterwards Vicar of Clifton, in a sermon preached at the former place, and entitled *Personal Confession to God in Public* (pp. 7, 8).

“General Thanksgiving” meant *a thanksgiving to be repeated by all the congregation*, in spite of the italics in which the *Amen* at the end of the General Thanksgiving was printed.

But among all the bad traits seen in the Low-Church party at this time, perhaps the worst was the respect which Low-Church people now had for persons rather than for principles. The writer once addressed a relative, then a member of the “Church Association,” urging him to withdraw from that Society, on the ground that the members were committed to profanity, hypocrisy, and positive falsehood: profanity, in sending persons to attend church for the purpose of spying out, in the officiating clergyman, grounds of prosecution; hypocrisy, in that while they did this they nevertheless still persisted in professing to seek the promotion of spiritual religion; and falsehood, in declaring one of their objects to be the upholding of the doctrine and principles of the Church of England, while getting up a petition for abolishing auricular confession; such confession forming a part of the Church’s system in the case of all conscience-burdened sinners. The person addressed did not question the truth of the allegations, but replied that the names of such and such persons were a guarantee of the right practice of that Association of which they were members! Nor was this the only instance of the kind which came within our personal knowledge. Here was a result of Low-Church teaching on the subject of worldliness. Low-Church preachers had declaimed against balls, races, plays, concerts, oratorios, cards, and

evening-parties (those excepted which were to include an exposition of Scripture and a prayer); as if these, and nothing else, were worldly occupations, and as if those who enjoyed them, and no one else, were worldly people! And they had thus entirely shut out from view the truth that “the world” is everybody and everything apart from God, and that worldliness is taking our rule of faith or of practice from other people (religious people included), rather than from God through His Word and ordinances.

We note these bad traits as manifested in the Low-Church party; but it must be borne in mind, at the same time, that they were chiefly manifested in one particular section of the party. The Low-Church party had, as we have observed before, come into two divisions: the more bigoted and narrow-minded, which arrogated to itself exclusively the title of Evangelical; and the more liberal, which its opponents designated as “Neo-Evangelical.” To these last, and to their characteristics, Mr. Wilson, the Vicar of Islington, probably alluded when, in the circular invitation issued by him for the Islington Clerical Meeting of 1884, he said, “The old-fashioned Evangelical doctrines by which our fathers walked, and which, we fear, are being sullied by the admixture of questionable views of truth.” It would seem that the more devout or intelligent Low-Churchmen shrank from the Zuinglianism which was held by other members of the party, and from the irreverence and carelessness in Divine Service with which that Zuinglianism was associated; they felt, too, that

High-Churchmen, equally with themselves, trusted implicitly in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and sought to be justified through faith therein, and that therefore there was not as much difference between High-Churchmen and themselves as they might once have thought. They were, in fact, being taught of God to embrace the Catholic faith, though they knew it not; and thus they did not mind associating with High-Churchmen in ways whereof their more bigoted brethren disapproved.

CHAPTER LXXV.

What the Low-Church Party might have done. Bad Blood. Effect of the Persecution on the Persecutors. Results of Low-Church Policy on the Moral State of the Nation. Special National Sins. Disestablishment of the Church. Lessons suggested by these ANNALS. Future of the Low-Church Party. Duties of the Church.

TAKING now a general glance over that Immoral Period (as we have found it necessary to designate it) the events of which we have had, in the execution of our design, to narrate last, we are naturally led to compare in our minds the work actually done by the Low-Church party with what might have been done had they been of a better mind towards their High-Church brethren.

The Guarantee Fund raised by the "Church Association" for the special purpose of persecution was, as we have seen, £50,000. This might have built ten churches at £5,000 apiece, or endowed ten with £150 a year apiece. The receipts of the

“Church Association” for 1875, under the heads of Subscriptions, Donations, and Collection at the Annual Meeting, were more than £2,700. This would have provided the congregations of the ten churches with £270 apiece, part of which might have formed in each case the stipend of a curate, and the rest defrayed the expenses of Divine Service for the current year. And the legacies (£3,655 4s. 5d.) received in the same time might have been devoted to any of the missionary organisations in connexion with the Low Church party.

The amount of force, spiritual, intellectual, and animal, which had been expended in the persecution, and which must have called out an equal amount of force in antagonism to it, it is of course impossible to estimate. It led, as we have seen, to the sacrifice of two lives—those of Mr. Purchas and Dr. Dykes. Had the same amount of energy been directed towards general efforts in the cause of Christianity, how much good might have been done! Both the Low-Churchman and the High-Churchman might have continued to teach, each in his own way, the great doctrines of human corruption, and salvation through Christ, and the great principles of truth and right. Instead of planning how to attack the nearest Ritualist, the Low-Churchmen might have been planning some new scheme of parochial or diocesan usefulness, or devising how to make existing agencies more efficient. Instead of composing a tract against the shocking enormity of wearing vestments of a certain cut, or to prove that the Church of England may properly be called by a name which

she has not only excluded from every one of her formularies, but generally repudiated, the Low-Churchmen, might have been considering how to make some difficult text of God's holy Word plain and practically useful for ordinary Christians.

The amount of bad blood, too, which was generated by the action of the "Church Association" must have formed no small hindrance to the spread of generally acknowledged Christian principles in the community at large. Our heart may be full of love and charity for our friends; but when a person turns up who is subscribing his money and using his influence with the object of depriving us and some of our friends of our respective livelihoods, and maybe of putting us into prison and despoiling us of our goods, our love and charity undergoes a modification, and, unless we are very great saints indeed, it is but too certain that the modification of our love and charity will involve a diminution of our general religion. As it was, we ourselves could not but withdraw from the society of those who adopted such a course towards us and our friends, and there was nothing in our case to make it at all singular. Now, splits and breaches between persons who ought to be friends are not so easily healed as made.

And what can have been the effect of the persecution upon the persecutors themselves? A Secretary of one of the principal Low-Church societies once assured us that he found the work of incessant preaching for his Society a bad thing for his spiritual life. The Rev. Robert Maguire

had the like experience, we have been told, in reference to the work of lecturing for the Islington Protestant Institute, and was led in consequence to give up the work in question ; and, indeed, if a man's spiritual life was injured by his having to do the work of the Protestant Institute, how much more spiritual injury must have been incurred by a person who undertook to do any work for the "Church Association !" It might be enough for the Protestant Institute to inveigh against the errors of Popery in the abstract ; to prove to the satisfaction of one's audience that the Pope was Antichrist, that it was idolatry to make a goddess of the Blessed Virgin, that there might be superstition in the use of holy-water, and formalism in the use of a rosary ; to demonstrate the absurdity, not to say the blasphemy, of the position that a man could create God, and that by withholding the intention of his mind he could stop the effect of any ordinance of Christ or of His Church which he was engaged in administering. A "Church Association" lecturer, however, had to inveigh against a set of men who were members of the same communion with himself ; and thus his charity would suffer. And he would have to uphold, in his speeches and addresses, as the law of the Church of England, what he knew still better and better to be the very reverse ; and thus his truthfulness also would suffer.

If now we consider the moral state of the nation, we seem to see in various common evil traits the results of Low-Church policy generally. When we have heard of Asiatic merchants refusing Manchester fabrics on account of the size with

which the woven stuffs were found to have been saturated for the sake of making them appear better than they really were, we have not been able to help calling to mind a speech delivered by Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P., at the opening of an Anabaptist meeting-house in Shoreditch in the month of November 1878. He must, that gentleman was reported to have said, express his belief that there were hundreds of Evangelical clergymen of the Established Church who were endorsing a lie by continuing in it. . . . Through his connexion with the City he was brought in contact with the heads of commercial houses who conversed about cases of fraud and dishonesty there, and he had heard the very position of clergymen quoted—he did not say as justifying, but at least as encouraging such things. These honoured men—for they were honoured men—were willing to continue to receive money belonging to the Church. . . . under false pretences. He held that they had no moral right to be where they were, and he believed the force of their example was telling fearfully on the morality of the common people.* When we have been told of the invasion of other men's rights by trades-unions and members of trades-unions, we have not been able to help associating such things in our own minds with that Protestantism which appeals to the will of the multitude rather than to the truth and commandments of God. When we have been brought face to face with drunkenness, the thought has occurred, May

* Letter in *Church Times* of November 22, 1878.

not this be owing to the fact that systematic fasting and abstinence have been so much discouraged by the Low-Church party? And still more positively and strongly have we felt that there would not have been so much manifold impurity as there has, if Low-Church preachers had taught their hearers to look upon their bodies as being members of Christ by virtue of their baptism, and that they were therefore at once both bound to resist temptation, and endued with a Divine ability so to do. Would not, moreover, the amount not only of impurity alone but of sin generally in the Church have been less than it is if the ministry of Absolution had not been denied, and Confession with a view to Absolution had not been discouraged in every way by the Low-Church party? When we read St. Paul's words to the Corinthians that the ministry of Absolution was to be exercised in one particular case, "lest Satan should get an advantage over us,"* is it possible to avoid a conviction that the case deprecated by the Apostle has been verified in the Church of England generally, and mainly through the line taken by Low-Churchmen? Moreover, we are constrained to ask, Would there have been such flagrant perversions of justice, would there have been such shameless promulgation of falsehood from the seat of judgment, if in the time of their power Low-Church bishops and clergy had insisted more fully on the necessity of righteousness, and if they had taught more forcibly that those who do unrighteousness shall not inherit the kingdom of

* 2 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

God ; * and if they had pointed out publicly that the perverting of judgment and justice by those who sit on the bench of authority is one of those sins against which the prophets of the Old Dispensation lifted up their voices most strenuously, as being peculiarly offensive to the God of truth and right ? Even if they did really deem that the pronouncements of judges ought in all cases to receive deference and obedience, however apparently contrary to law ; yet, as ministers of the Most High God, their duty was to look upon things as God looks upon them, and to teach their hearers to do the like. We cannot but think that if Low-Church clergymen had done this when the first iniquitous judgment had been published, the other judgments might have been less iniquitous than they were.

Yet again. While we write we do so under a sense of several other deep national sins. We have, as a nation, deserted native tribes in Africa which we had pledged ourselves to defend. In a spirit of cowardly indolence, we have sought to avoid responsibilities in Egypt which rightly belonged to us. And when a brave soldier had undertaken a work which our bad policy had made necessary, and which he seemed (and very likely was) the only person capable of accomplishing, we deserted him in the most shameful manner, so that at last he fell under the swords of his enemies. These things were done by the Government, and had the approval of majorities in the representative assembly of the nation ; and the thought occurs, as we call

* 1 Cor. vi. 9.

them to mind with shame, Is not the Low-Church party answerable for them to a great extent, by directing its energies and its eloquence against Ritualists rather than against that wrong-doing against which every man's moral sense bears witness, and by thus leading its adherents to imagine that zeal against a theological system, or against a religious opponent, will compensate in some sense for a neglect to cultivate such virtues as even heathenism counted in the catalogue of duties? It was a sad conclusion to the work done by a religious party to have been in any degree instrumental to the moral delinquency of a whole nation. It is a sad reflection that a party whose chief adherents had contributed so much as the early Low-Churchmen had done to the exemplification of the sacred proverb, "Righteousness exalteth a nation,"* should in a later generation have helped to bring about an exemplification of the rest of the verse—"Sin is a reproach to any people." May God pour out upon us a spirit of repentance, so that we may abstain from sinning any more against His eternal laws, even though our repentance be too late to avert His sore judgments for what is already past!

Once more. If the Church of England should be despoiled of her rights and of her property altogether according to the will of her enemies, no gift of prophecy seems necessary for foretelling that such a calamity will be owing to the teaching and conduct of the Low-Church party. It is to that teaching and conduct in former generations that by far the greater part of Dissent at the present

* Prov. xiv. 34.

day is owing. We have seen how Dissent was directly taught by the elder Venn; we have seen how it was indirectly taught by Thomas Scott; we have seen how Low-Churchmen of various generations fraternised with Dissenters not only where there was a common moral platform, such, perhaps, as was furnished by the British and Foreign Bible Society, but also where they could not associate with Dissenters without denying some of the principles of their own communion. It has often been charged upon High-Churchmen that they drove the people into Dissent by their teaching and their introduction of new ceremonies. Even supposing that some persons had been led to forsake their parish churches through hearing a sermon too short to do them any good worth mentioning, or through hearing the prayers read too fast, or indistinctly, or on account of some indiscretion in the clergyman (though we believe the number of such cases to have been greatly exaggerated, especially during what we have termed the Immoral Period): yet the question still remains, Why such persons went to the meeting-house? And the answer in all cases will have to be, "Because they knew, or at least believed, that in the meeting-house they would hear doctrine differing either not at all, or else not very much, from what they had been accustomed to hear from Low-Church preachers in the Church." And when the cause of separation was the clergyman's conscientious compliance with the Church's plain and express rules, the question will arise, How was it that the people had not been taught to observe

those rules, or to acquiesce in their observance by the clergy? And if the answer had been given, "Because there were more important things to be taught—the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and faith—faith in Christ and repentance towards God,"—it may be rejoined that such an answer will not cover the case of a congregation in which such teaching had been given persistently for five, ten, twenty, or fifty years. Yes! the charge of having seduced people into Dissent, and, indeed, of being answerable, probably, for by far the largest portion of what is called the "orthodox Dissent" of the present day, is one to which the Low-Church party must plead Guilty. So that if Disestablishment comes, it will be a judgment which the Low-Church party will have brought upon itself.

Again, therefore, we are constrained to exclaim, May God give us repentance: may He give us repentance for the sin, so largely harboured amongst us, of sinfully compromising some of those principles adherence to which has been, in the case of every clergyman, the subject-matter of formal and solemn profession!

We have now effected the purpose which we proposed to ourselves in commencing this work. We have finished the *Annals of the Low-Church Party in England* down to the decease of Archbishop Tait, according to the best of our power and opportunities. Before, however, we lay down the pen, we must detain our readers yet a short time, while pointing out one or two lessons suggested by the study.

What is the chief lesson suggested by the history of the Low-Church party in its growth? Surely it is—*how much may be done where one idea fills the mind*. While the Low-Church party was in its ascendancy, every Low-Churchman deserving the name said to himself, “I have been saved by Christ crucified—what can I do for bringing others to be saved in like manner?” Hence their preaching, their expounding, their prayer-meetings; hence their missions, home and foreign, with all the machinery for supporting them and carrying them on.

And what may we learn by the history of the same party in its decline? Surely the lesson is—*how much harm may be done by religious people where one article of the faith is not held*. We have seen that Low-Church people, from the very commencement of the movement, failed to hold that article of the Creed—“The Holy Catholic Church”—as understood in the beginning. They pronounced that article with their lips, but in their minds they meant, not the company of the baptized, but the company of those who are to be saved at last. Hence their depreciation of everything churchly: of the Church itself, of the Church’s fellowship, sacraments, ministries, rules. For in that article of the Creed there is involved that entire system of religion which is called the *Sacramental System*. The article has ever been understood as referring to that outward and visible company which is entered by Christian baptism,* and membership wherein is kept up through par-

* 1 Cor. xii. 13.

taking of the consecrated Bread in the Holy Communion.* If this is so, then the supernatural character of those ordinances follows: Baptism is seen to be a real engrafting into Christ, and the consecrated elements are seen to be verily and indeed His Body and Blood; for the Church is Christ's Body—the means by which He from heaven does on earth that earthly work of His which has still to be done. And, furthermore, it is seen that by virtue of the indwelling of Christ's Spirit, the Holy Ghost, in the Church, Christ is present in every member both to will and to do according to the good pleasure of the Father, as well in those actions which the member in question may have to do in the sphere of the world, as in those which he may have to do in the sphere of the Church: and so that where this fails to be evidenced, it is only because the individual member is (to use New Testament language) living and walking in or according to the flesh, and so interposing a hindrance to the purposes of God and to the working of Christ by the Holy Ghost. There follows also an appreciation of Christian ministry in its several degrees and kinds. Ministers in their several orders and positions are seen to be ordinances of the Lord, by which He in the heavens ministers His manifold grace to His members on earth, and even, within certain limits, to the world around. Low-Churchmen, however, failed to hold the aforesaid article of the Creed; and hence their failure to realise those other truths just stated was but a logical consequence.

* 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

What sort of a future the party has before it we cannot pretend to forecast in all respects. In some respects, indeed, the future seems clear to any ordinary sagacity; for while we write, that same process is going on whereof we have spoken before: the party is losing its more devout members at one end, and its more intellectual members at the other; the more devout are becoming High-Churchmen, and the more intellectual are becoming Broad-Churchmen. And there can be little doubt, if any doubt at all, but in the progress of education the process will continue until the Low-Church party has ceased to exist, save as represented, perhaps, by a mere handful of individuals among the clergy, with their lay adherents; these holding that minimum of religion towards God which public opinion will deem respectable, and ready to be, like salt without savour, cast out and trodden under foot of men.

What, however, will become of Low-Church institutions is another matter. One after another of the Simeon Trustees may be converted to the Catholic Faith, and so the appointments made by those trustees may come to be as much to the benefit of the Church's cause as they are now to its detriment. The "Church Missionary Society" may cease to employ Presbyterians and other Dissenters, and may amalgamate with the venerable Society for Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. St. John's College, Highbury, may cease to furnish recruits and officers to the "Salvation Army," and may become worthy of the title which

it has appropriated—"The London College of Divinity."

“And that mixture of malice and humbug,
 The ‘Church Association,’
 May pass, ’mid the Church’s rejoicings,
 To an utter annihilation.
 The Chairman’s seat unhonoured,
 To a meeting none found to venture;
 And each member who would not repent him
 Become a professed Dissenter.”

But whether or not all this will be verified in subsequent history may depend on the Church of England in general. To us God may be saying in reference thereto, as He said by His prophet to His Jewish people in reference to the building of the temple, “This shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God.”* Let the Church hold the faith and teach the faith in all its integrity, and not be ashamed of so doing, or of the results which may follow. Let her seek the glory of the Lord her Head, and be careless about human approbation or human resources in comparison therewith. Let her not aim at being established by man in the earth, but hope to the end for the grace which is to be brought her at the appearing of the Lord, and for her being taken away from the earth to be with Him in His glory as His Bride, the channel of Divine blessing to all creation. Let her seek to learn the Lord’s present will by whatever means He may be pleased to use for conveying intimations thereof. Let her foster His life in all her members, and give His Spirit full

* Zech. vi. 15.

scope for manifesting His presence in whatever ways He may be pleased to manifest it. Then, in the day of Christ's power, when the spiritual Moab (Protestantism) is trodden down under Him, as straw is trodden down in a manure tank,* may be fulfilled those words of the Psalm in the case of the Church of England, the daughter of the modern Tyre, "The daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift." †

* Is. xxv. 10. See Delitzsch's *Commentary* in loco.

† Ps. xlv. 12.

INDEX.

ABB

- ABBOT* (*Archbishop*), **i.** 81
Abbot, Jacob, **i.** 406
Abbott (*Rev. —*), vicar of Thorn-
 ton, Bagworth, and Markfield,
i. 173
Abbott (*Rev. B.*), **ii.** 218
Absolution, doctrine of, taught
 in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.**
 404; revival of it, **ii.** 66; in
 Mattins and Evensong, to be
 said by people, 420; Scott's
 views on, **i.** 197
 "Acceptable," cant term, **i.** 369
Acland (*Rev. —*), intruding
 clergyman at St. Vedast's,
 Foster Lane, **ii.** 416
Adam (*Rev. T.*), **i.** 102. Letter
 to, from Sam. Walker, 151
Addington, Bucks, consecration
 of chancel, **ii.** 87, 88
Adhemar (*Count*), **i.** 98
Adkins (*Wm.*), tries to stir up
 opposition to Mr. Emraght, **ii.**
 458; tries to get Mr. Elwin
 inhibited, 472
 "Advertisements" of Arch-
 bishop Parker, **ii.** 325, 373
Aggression, Papal, **ii.** 12
Ahier (*Rev. P.*), **ii.** 403
Aidan's (*St.*) *College, Birken-*
head, **ii.** 42
Alban's (*St.*), *Holborn*, **ii.** 236;
 devotion at, **i.** 371
Albury Park, meetings at, **i.** 310
Aldwell (*Rev. —*), **ii.** 394
Alexander (*M. S.*), **i.** 391; first
 Anglican bishop at Jerusalem,
 454; his consecration, 455;
 his decease, 500
Alford (*Rev. H.*), on opponents of

APO

- Tractarianism, **i.** 441; opposes
 Sabbatarianism, and there-
 upon abused by the *Record*,
ii. 39; Dean of Canterbury,
 77; joins in the "Evangelical
 Alliance" Communion at
 Berlin, 62
All Saints', Margaret St., con-
 secration of, **ii.** 215
All Souls', Langham Place, **ii.**
 445
Allen (*Rev. Hugh*), lecturer at
 St. George's-in-the-East, **ii.**
 104
Allon (*Rev. Dr.*), **ii.** 448
Alphington parishioners desire
 revision of rubrics, &c., **i.** 474
Altars, given by Bishop Hamil-
 ton, **ii.** 227
Amphlett (*Mr. Baron*), **ii.** 324
Ampton, *Rev. H. V. Elliott*
 curate of, **ii.** 180
Amusements, worldly, **i.** 256
 "Anchor" *Society* (*Bristol*), **ii.**
 456
Andrew's (*St.*) *Halstead*, dis-
 turbance at, **ii.** 112
Andrew's (*St.*), *Wolverhampton*,
ii. 352
Andrews, Bishop, **i.** 79
Andrews (*T. R.*), Chairman of
 the "Church Association," **ii.**
 369, 443
Anglo-Israelitism, **i.** 382
Anonymous letters, **ii.** 113, 208
Apocrypha, never read by Dean
 Close, **ii.** 91; disliked by Low-
 Churchmen, *ib.*
Apostolic succession of bishops
 asserted by Robinson, **i.** 419;

APO

- taught in *Tracts for the Times*, 404
 "Apostolical Preaching," by Rev. J. B. Sumner, **i.** 290; teaches Newman Baptismal Regeneration, **ii.** 205
Aquinas (*St. Thos.*), his hymn on the Eucharist, **ii.** 81
Arctic Expedition, **ii.** 311
Arminius, **i.** 80
Armstrong (*Rev. J.*), mobbed, **i.** 471
Armytage (*Rev. W. G.*), **ii.** 331
Arnold (*Rev. Dr.*), his Protestant creed, **ii.** 116; his principles of education, 120; his dislike of the Athanasian Creed, 121; would have Communion administered by commanding officers, 123; wishes for daily services, &c., 125
Ars (*Vianney, Curé of*), **ii.** 196
Art, Protestantism against, **i.** 475
Articles (*Lambeth*), **i.** 59
Articles (*The XXXIX.*), Scott's attention drawn to, **i.** 181; Wilberforce refuses subscription to, 221; attempt to make them the standard of doctrine, 508; remarks on their authority, **ii.** 9
Asceticism. of Low-Churchmen, **i.** 256, 376
Ashampstead, Rev. W. Marsh incumbent of, **ii.** 176
Ashton (*Richard*), **i.** 110
Astley (*Rev. C. T.*), **ii.** 371
Aston Sandford, Rev. T. Scott rector of, **i.** 191
Aston Trustees, **ii.** 464; purchase the presentation to Holy Trinity, Bordesley, 463
Athanasian Creed disliked by T. Scott at first, **i.** 181, **ii.** 90; by Dr. Arnold, 121; Scott's subsequent "little objection" to, **i.** 194; omitted by Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, 494; omitted in a "Free Church" **ii.** 245 (note); agitation against, 287; Archbishop Tait's declaration concerning,

BAP

- 288; the Archbishop impressed by its recital, 486
Atkinson (*Rev.*—), schoolmaster at Wakefield, **i.** 154
Atonement, Tractarian ignorance on the, **i.** 410
Atterbury (*Bishop*), **i.** 243
Auckland (*Lord*), succeeds Bishop Bagot at Bath and Wells, **ii.** 48; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155
Augsburg Confession, studied by L. Richmond, **i.** 303
Augustine (*St.*) of Hippo, his doctrine of Predestination, **i.** 78
Auriol (*Rev. E.*), **ii.** 329
Aylmer (*Bishop*), **i.** 75
Aylstone, **i.** 158
BADNALL, (*Archdeacon*), **ii.** 157
Baggallay (*Lord Justice*), **ii.** 407, 473
Bagot (*Bishop*), **i.** 426; his difference with Archdeacon Denison, **ii.** 45
Bagshawe (*Mr. Greaves*), **ii.** 451
Bagworth Church, **i.** 172
Bailiffs in Mr. Green's rectory, **ii.** 424, 426
Baker (*Rev. Samuel*), **i.** 466
Bale (*Bishop*), **i.** 41; how regarded by Low-Churchmen, 451; his controversial language, 43
Bâle, Missionary seminary at, **i.** 312, 515
Ball (*Irish Lord Chancellor*), **ii.** 307
Balls condemned by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 376
Baneroft (*Archbishop*), **i.** 397; biographical notice of, **i.** 77; suspensions of Puritans in his time, **i.** 76
Bannister, name of a complainant against Mr. Booker, **ii.** 401
Baptism, how ministered in 18th century, **i.** 95; tract on, by Mant. 291; views on, of Dean Milner. 203; of Simeon, 215; of Wilberforce, 242; of

BAP

BIS

- Mr. Gorham, **ii.** 3; of infants, T. Scott's views on, **i.** 184; how ministered by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 501
- Baptismal Office*, H. Venn the younger's explanation of, **ii.** 293; profane interpolation in, 8
- Bardsley* (Rev. —) hissed at Manchester Church Congress, **ii.** 174
- Baring* (Bishop), **ii.** 73, 409; proposes to rule on party lines, 76; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 154; inhibits coadjutor-bishop of Edinburgh, 230; refuses to attend the first Pan-Anglican Conference, 248; breach of promise by, 296; refuses to license curates for Dr. Dykes, 330
- Barker* (Bishop), **ii.** 31
- Barnabas*' (St.), Pinlico, ornaments in, complained of by Westerton, **ii.** 50; by Mr. Beal, *ib.*; Privy Council judgment thereon, 52
- Barrett* (Rev. T. S.), **ii.** 394
- Barrington* (Bishop), **i.** 243
- Barrington* (Viscount), **i.** 99
- Barrow* (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 243
- Barton* (Rev. J.), **ii.** 452
- Basildon*, Rev. W. Marsh incumbent of, **ii.** 176
- Bateman* (James, Esq.), **ii.** 475
- Bathurst* (Bishop), **i.** 288; **ii.** 180
- Bathurst* (Lord Chancellor), **i.** 168, 230
- Battersby* (Rev. T. D. H.), **ii.** 94
- Battie* (Dr.), **i.** 111
- Baylee* (Rev. Dr.), first principal of St. Aidan's, Birkenhead, **ii.** 42, 43
- Baxter* (Richard), **i.** 243
- Beaconsfield* (Earl of), see *Disraeli*
- Beckett* (Rev. W. H. F.), **ii.** 18
- Becon*, Catechism of, **i.** 21
- Beddington*, Rev. W. Marsh rector of, **ii.** 175, 179
- Benediction* pronounced by Low-Church deacon, **ii.** 501
- Bengough*, name of an "aggrieved parishioner," **ii.** 414
- Bennett* (Rev. W. J. E.), vicar of Frome, **ii.** 26; author of a paper in *The Church and the World*, **ii.** 277; and of *A Plea for Toleration*, 278; his incorrect language, 278; modified by him, 281
- Ben-Oliel* (Rev. M. M.), **ii.** 495
- Benson* (Rev. C.), **i.** 447
- Benson* (Rev. R. M.), **ii.** 454
- Benwell* (Rev. A. F.), **ii.** 449
- Beresford*, (Archbishop), **ii.** 154
- Berlin*, Conference of the "Evangelical Alliance" at, **ii.** 61
- Betton's Charity*, Trustees of, **ii.** 365
- Bevan* (C. L.), member of an "Evangelical Alliance," **ii.** 47
- Beveridge* (Bishop), **i.** 79, 404
- Bible Society* (British and Foreign), see *British and Foreign Bible Society*
- Bible Society* (Merchant Seamen's), **i.** 292
- Bickersteth* (Rev. E.), 286, 448; at the Liverpool Conference on Christian union, 489; his decease, character, and works, 518; his views on spiritual manifestations, 338; on baptism, **ii.** 11; his Sabbatarianism, 36; his disobedience to his diocesan, 197
- Bickersteth* (Bishop Robert), **ii.** 74; refuses to license curates for Mr. Greenwell, 330; allows prosecution of Mr. Redhead, 400
- Biddenham*, Rev. Grimshawe vicar of, **i.** 175
- Biddulph* (Rev. T. J.), **i.** 291
- Bingham* (Rev. R.), **ii.** 94
- Birkenhead*, usage in clerical meeting at, **ii.** 91
- Birkmyre* (Rev. N. Y.), **ii.** 481
- Birks* (Rev. T. R.), **i.** 288; opposes Broad-Church teaching, **ii.** 125
- Bishoprics* founded by "Church Missionary Society," **ii.** 58; (Colonial) approved of by Low-

BIS

- Churchmen, 187; (New home) deprecated, 90
- Bisley*, Rev. R. Cecil rector of, **i.** 174
- Blackburn* (Lord), **ii.** 384, 408
- "*Black Rubric*," **i.** 86, 417
- Blackstone*, his experience of Anglican preaching, **i.** 94
- Blakelocke* (Rev. R. R.), **ii.** 331
- Blakeney* (Rev. J. E.), **ii.** 402
- Bleek* (Dr.), **ii.** 160
- Bligh* (Hon. and Rev. E. V.) advocates revision of Prayer-book, **ii.** 96; chairman of the Prayer-book Revision Society, 428
- Blomfield* (Bishop C. J.), his family prayers, **i.** 255; his Sabbatarianism, *ib.*; forbids spiritual manifestations, 335; assists to consecrate Bishop Alexander, 455; his fourth visitation charge, 463; his wishes for ritual obedience resisted by Islington clergy, 465; an assessor in the Gorham appeal, **ii.** 5; Mr. Bennett's correspondence with him, 26; on the judicial committee about the Knights-bridge churches, 52
- Blunt* (Archdeacon), **ii.** 449
- Blunt* (Rev. W.), **i.** 468
- Bodington* (Rev. C.), his prosecution fails, **ii.** 352; more attacks, 395
- Boleau* (Major-General), **ii.** 402
- Bolland* (Rev. H.), **ii.** 234
- Bolton* (J. B.), **ii.** 395
- Book of Common Prayer* seems sometimes to encourage Zuinglianism, **i.** 84; appreciated by T. Scott, 193; for family prayers, 180; Evangelical character of, 248; put after articles and homilies, 275; remarks on its authority, **ii.** 9; movement for revising, see *Prayer-book Revision Society*; former editions of, see *Prayer-book*.

BRI

- "*Book of Discipline*" signed by more than 500 clergy, **i.** 75
- Booker* (Rev. G.), **ii.** 401
- Borthwick* (Rev. R. B.), **ii.** 449
- Bound* (Dr.) an early Sabbatarian, **i.** 254
- Bowden*, author of four *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 404
- Bowdler* (John), **i.** 237
- Bowen* (Lord Justice), **ii.** 440
- Bowes* (Lady), **i.** 76
- Bowing* at the Holy Name, **ii.** 189
- Boyce* (Rev. —), **ii.** 394
- Boyd* (Dean), **ii.** 91
- Bradford* (John), opinions of, **i.** 31
- Bradford* (Mr.) appeals to Lord Penzance against Churchwarden Fry, **ii.** 348
- Bradlaugh* (Charles. M.P.), **ii.** 368
- Bramwell* (Lord Justice), **ii.** 407
- Brethren* (Plymouth), **i.** 339
- Brett* (Lord Justice), **ii.** 324, 382, 444, 473
- Brett* (Mr.), **ii.** 232
- Brett* (Sir W. B.), **ii.** 440
- Breviary* (the Roman) discussed in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 406; Mr. Neale's copy of, 506
- Brewer* (Rev. —) of Stepney, **i.** 135
- Bribery* by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 467
- Bridges* (Rev. C.), short notice of, **ii.** 283; his *Scriptural Studies*, **i.** 393; his views on baptism, **ii.** 11; his Sabbatarianism, 36; his ignorance of the nature of the Christian Dispensation, 194 (note)
- Bristed* on the Cambridge Camden Society, **i.** 479 (note)
- Bristol Cathedral*, removal of statues from, **ii.** 331; pulpit of, refused to Mr. Randall, 456
- Bristow* (Rev. R. R.) **ii.** 398.
- British and Foreign Bible Society*, **i.** 292; supported by L. Richmond, 303; by Rev. H. V. Elliott, **ii.** 180
- "*British Critic*," **i.** 433

BRO

- Broad-Church Party*, rise of, **ii.** 116
Brougham (Lord), **ii.** 6
Brown (Rev. Moses), **i.** 136
Brown's Bible used by Simeon, **i.** 385
Browne (Bishop Harold), **ii.** 77, 384
Brunel (Chancellor), **ii.** 305.
Bucer taught Zuinglianism, **i.** 10; Grindal's intimacy with, 55
Budd (Rev. —), **i.** 287, 288
Bulkeley, name of an "aggrieved parishioner," **ii.** 355
Bull (Rev. —). Independent minister, **i.** 180
Bullinger, **i.** 49, 51, 52
Bunn (W. G.), a spy, **ii.** 384
Bunsen, Chevalier, review of some of his works by Dr. R. Williams, **ii.** 132
Burn (Rev. W. P.), **ii.** 108
Burnet (Bishop), **ii.** 123; his *History of his Own Times* read by T. Scott, **i.** 179
Burton Latimer, Rev. — Grimshaave rector of, **i.** 175
Butcher (Joseph), prosecutor of Mr. Bodington, **ii.** 352, 395
Bute (Marquess of), **i.** 98
- CADOGAN (Hon. and Rev. B.)*, **i.** 168, 210; his ministry attended by W. Marsh, **ii.** 176
Cairns (Earl), **ii.** 253, 270, 272, 324, 408; his patronage, **ii.** 445
Calasio (Marius de), Romaine edits his Hebrew Concordance and Lexicon, **i.** 104
Calthrop (Rev. G.), **ii.** 448
Calvin, Institutes of, taught at Oxford, **i.** 73
Calvinism taught generally under Edward VI. and Elizabeth, **i.** 73; more under the latter, 78; reason why, 79; held by T. Scott, 193
Calvinists, secession of, **i.** 293
Cambridge, Protestant teaching at, **i.** 73

CHA

- Cambridge Camden Society*, **i.** 478
Campbell (Bishop J. C.), **ii.** 74; omits Communion at an ordination, 75; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 154; supports Bishop Gray, 169
Campbell (Lord), **ii.** 5, 83
Campbell (Mary), healing of, **i.** 319
Cant, **i.** 368
Cardale (J. B.), 325, 336, 339 (note)
 "Cardiphonia," by Newton, **i.** 141
Card-playing condemned by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 376; given up by T. Scott, and why, 183
Carisbrooke Case, **i.** 446
Carlton (Bishop), **i.** 80
Carlyon (Rev. P.), **i.** 470
Carr (Bishop Thos.), **ii.** 47
Carter (Rev. T. T.), first attempt against him fails, **ii.** 355
Cartwright (the Puritan) allowed by Archbishop Whitgift to preach, **i.** 59
Catcott (Rev. —), **i.** 111
Catechising in public discontinued by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 355
Catechism, Nowell's, **i.** 26; King Edward VI.'s, 23, 26, 27; translated in *Christian Observer*, 275
Catholicity preserved in Church of England, **i.** 76, 79
Cawood (Rev. J.), **ii.** 181
Cecil, Queen Elizabeth's Premier, **ii.** 325
Cecil (Rev. R.), **i.** 172, 277, 279; Mr. Cadogan preaches for him, 171; has hymn sung after second lesson, 355; anecdote of his preaching, **ii.** 195
Chalmers (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 19
Chalmers (Rev. F. S. C.), **ii.** 179
Chamberlain (Rev. T.), **ii.** 103
Chambers (J. D.) quoted, **ii.** 252
Chambers (Rev. J.), author of *The Priest in Absolution*, **ii.** 356

CHA

- Chambres (Rev. R.)*, **ii.** 336
Champneys (Dean), **ii.** 250
Chapels (proprietary), **i.** 357, **ii.** 186, 261
Chapman (Rev. H. E.), **ii.** 399,
 "Characteristics" of Lord Shaftesbury, **i.** 130
Charles (Rev. T.), **i.** 102
Charlotte Elizabeth advocates circumcision, **i.** 391; her remark about the fulness of the Gentiles, 455; her marriage and decease, 500
Chatham (Earl of), **i.** 99.
Cheese (Rev. E.), **ii.** 75
Chelmsford (Lord), **ii.** 83, 253, 269, 272
Chelsca (St. Luke's), Mr. Cadogan rector of, **i.** 169
Chichester (Earl of), quoted, **i.** 367 (note)
Chichester Theological College, **ii.** 84
Chitty (Mr. Justice), **ii.** 440
Chobham, Rev. R. Cecil vicar of, **i.** 174
Choirs, surpliced, **i.** 511
Choral services deprecated by Archbishop Sumner, **ii.** 188
Chorley Church, sacrilege in, **ii.** 468
Christ Church, Salford, Rev. Hugh Stowell first incumbent of, **ii.** 183
 "Christian Observer," **i.** 274; in controversy with Newman, 420; its difficulties, **ii.** 285
 "Christian Observer and Advocate," **i.** 274, **ii.** 312
 "Christian System," Robinson's, **i.** 160, 168
Christianity, Low-Church views of, **i.** 232
Church and State, relations of, discussed in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 405
 "Church and the World (The)," **ii.** 277
 "Church Association (The)," formation of, **ii.** 219; means employed by, 221; its address to the people of England, 223; bad character of some of its

CHU

- members, 234; protested against by the *Record*, *ib.*; prayer used at its meetings, 235 (note); receives Mr. Mackonochie's costs, 311; its inquisition after Ritualism, 351; countenances sale of *The Confessional Unmasked*, 366; gets up anti-confessional petition, *ib.*; attempts to molest Mr. Lowder, 389; falsehood circulated by, see *Falschood*; thanks Canon Girdlestone for refusing pulpit to Mr. Randall, 457; refuses to join the E.C.U. in protesting against the Bordesley sacrilege, 469; tries to get Mr. Enraght imprisoned a second time, 473; at a standstill, 476; fails to form a branch at Plymouth, *ib.*; gets Mr. Mackonochie "deprived" of St. Peter's, London Docks, 487; more and more detested, 489; its impertinent letter to Bishop Jackson, 490; rebuked, 492; its plans against bishops, 494
Church, behaviour in, **i.** 100
Church-buildings of the eighteenth century, **i.** 88
Church Congress, see *Congress*
 "Church Home Mission," **ii.** 56
Church (the), rites and customs of, discussed in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 405
 "Church Missionary Society," formation of, **i.** 267; character of its first missionary candidates, 191; T. Scott their tutor, *ib.*; attempt to swamp the Committee with High-Churchmen, 273; meetings of, at Hull, 294; supported by L. Richmond, 303; by H. V. Elliott, **ii.** 180; jubilee of, **i.** 514; founds bishoprics, **ii.** 58; opposed by Bishop Wilson of Calcutta, 59; appoints a Presbyterian to a medical mission, 450
Church of England Tract Society, **i.** 285

CHU

- "*Church Pastoral Aid Society*,"
i. 441; line taken by, in refer-
 ence to Mr. Benson at Swan-
 sea, **ii.** 454; dictation by, as
 to hymnals, 455; income of,
 about 1882, 502; work of, in
 1883, 503
- Church principles* of T. Scott,
i. 193; of Simeon, 213; of the
 London Jews' Society, 279;
 of L. Richmond, 305; of Dan
 Wilson, 348; of Low-Church-
 men in general, 317
- Church Protestant Defence*
Society, **ii.** 81
- Church services* (Low-Church)
 described, **ii.** 500
- "*Church (The)*," how understood
 by Cranmer, **i.** 20; in King
 Edward's Catechism, 26; by
 Noel, 29; by Ridley, 30; by
 Coverdale, 35; by Hooper, 39;
 by Joseph Milner, 205; denial
 of, by Low-Churchmen, **ii.**
 510, 524
- "*Church Times*," quoted, **ii.** 428
- Charlton* (Rev. T. T.), **i.** 426
- Clapham*, Mr. Cunningham
 curate of, **ii.** 172
- "*Clapham Sect*," **i.** 236
- Clark* (Dr. Martin), **ii.** 450
- Clark* (Rev. E.), **ii.** 434
- Cloughton* (Bishop Piers), **ii.** 482
- Cloughton* (Bishop T. L.) orders
 St. James's, Hatcham, to be
 closed, **ii.** 336; revokes Mr.
 Browne's licence, 335; blesses
 Mr. Tooth's opponents, 338
- Clay* (Rev. E.), **ii.** 263
- Clerical societies*, **i.** 351
- Clifton* (Wm.), **ii.** 319
- Close* (Rev. F.) establishes
 Cheltenham training-colleges,
i. 486; his views on church
 restoration, 499; on baptism, **ii.**
 11; Dean of Carlisle, 77; with-
 draws from the S.P.C.K., 372
- Clunie* (Capt.), **i.** 135
- Cobham* (Lord), **i.** 45
- Cockburn* (Sir A.), **ii.** 83, 407;
 replies to Lord Penzance, 380
- Colenso* (Bishop) publishes a
 work on Romans, **ii.** 153; on

CON

- the Pentateuch and Joshua, *ib.*;
 presented for false teaching,
 157; tried, 160; deposed,
 161; his appeal to the Privy
 Council allowed, 162; officia-
 tes at Maritzburg, 163; is
 excommunicated, *ib.*; line
 taken by Low-Churchmen in
 regard to these proceedings, 165
- Coleridge* (Lord), **ii.** 325, 346,
 382, 444
- Collette* (Mr.), **ii.** 362
- Collier* (Sir R.), **ii.** 324, 384
- Collingridge* (Messrs.), **ii.** 405
- Collins* (Wm.), **ii.** 349
- Colonial and Continental*
Church Society, **ii.** 19; in-
 come and work of, about
 1882, 503
- Colonial Church and School*
Society (see page viii. vol.
ii.); amalgamates with the
 Newfoundland School Society,
ii. 18
- Colston* (Edward), **ii.** 456
- Colville* (Sir J.), **ii.** 324
- Colville* (Sir Wm.), **ii.** 253, 272
- Combe* (Chas.) signs a memorial
 against Mr. Edwards, **ii.** 301;
 his antecedents, 302; prosecutes
 Mr. Edwards, 308, 374, 375
- Commentary* of T. Scott, **i.** 190
- Commission* on Ritual, **ii.** 232;
 first report of, 243
- Communicating*, rare, **i.** 100;
 frequent, inculcated in *Tracts*
for the Times, 404, 405;
 weekly, recommended by
 Romaine and Howels, 418; in
 the palm, **ii.** 282, discouraged
 by Bp. Jacobson, 283; in the
 evening, see *Evening Com-*
munion
- Communion*, sought by T. Scott
 as a means of grace, **i.** 194
- "*Communion service*," **i.** 92
- "*Complete Duty of Man*," **i.** 121
- Comprehension of Dissenters*,
 plot for, **ii.** 31
- Concanon* (Rev. G. B.), **ii.** 224
 (note)
- Concerts* condemned by Low-
 Churchmen, **i.** 376

CON

- Conference* at Liverpool on Christian Union, **i.** 488
- Conference* (*Pan-Anglican*), see *Pan-Anglican Conference*
- Confession* (*auricular*) discouraged by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 171
- Confessional* at St. James's, Hatcham, damaging of, **ii.** 344
- "*Confessional Unmasked (The)*" exposed for sale at a Church-Association lecture, **ii.** 366
- Confirmation* in 18th century, **i.** 96
- Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament*, **ii.** 296, 365
- Congress* (*Church*) disapproved of by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 173, 370; at Sheffield, Low-Church proceedings with respect to, 402; at Swansea, 454
- Conon*, schoolmaster at Truro, **i.** 146
- Consecration* in Eucharist, Scottish prayer of, **i.** 492 (note); of a church by Abp. Whately, **ii.** 118
- Convocation* of Canterbury, revival of, **ii.** 19; Low-Church policy with regard to, *ib.*; Low-Churchmen alarmed at, 244
- Convocations*, action of, stopped by George I., **i.** 88; **ii.** 19
- Conyers* (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 260
- Cook* (*Rev. F. J.*) refuses Communion to Mr. Jenkins, **ii.** 313; proceedings thereupon, 314
- Cooper* (*C. B.*), **ii.** 463
- Cosin* (*Bishop*), how quoted by Privy Council, **ii.** 271 (note)
- Costs* (*bill of*) in Mr. Dale's case, **ii.** 416, 445; in Mr. Green's case, 421
- Cotterill* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 41
- Cotton* (*Dr.*), **i.** 142
- Cotton* (*Lord Justice*), **ii.** 382, 440, 444
- Counter-memorial* to the memorial of twenty-one Anglican priests, **ii.** 229
- Courtenay* (*Rev. A.*), **i.** 470

CUD

- Coverdale* (*Bishop*), **i.** 34; his share in the Geneva Bible, 60
- Cowan* (*Mr. J., M.P.*), **ii.** 363
- Cowie* (*Dean*), **ii.** 414
- Cowper-Temple* (*Mr., M.P.*), **ii.** 289
- Cowper* (*Wm.*), **i.** 142; quoted, 91, 93
- Cox* (*Bishop*), **i.** 77
- Cox* (*Rev. J. B.*), **ii.** 447
- Cox* (*Rev. W. H.*), **i.** 448
- Cranmer* (*Archbishop*) invited Bucer to England, **i.** 10; the leader of the Zuinglians in England, 16; his work on the Lord's Supper, *ib.*; studied by H. Venn the younger, **ii.** 292; his opinions on the Communion, **i.** 18; on the Church, 20; his intended Third Prayer-Book, **i.** 13
- Creed* (*the Apostles'*) suppressed on week-days by Dr. Jowett, **ii.** 288
- Creed* (*the Athanasian*), see *Athanasian Creed*
- Creeds*, Dr. Temple refuses to be bound by, **ii.** 122
- Creseitelli* (*Rev. D.*), **ii.** 323
- Crofts*, schoolmaster, **i.** 111
- Croom* (*Mr.*), churchwarden at St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 337
- Croquet*, **i.** 257
- Cross* (*sign of the*), **i.** 425; appearing inadvertently in a Heb. edition of the Pentateuch, **ii.** 28; on church vestments &c., complained of, **ii.** 35; on stole, 230; proposal to imprison for, **ii.** 496
- Cross, Holy* (church at Leeds), foundation of, **i.** 457
- Cross, Society of the Holy*, see *Holy Cross*
- Crowthey* (*Rev. —*), **i.** 277
- Crucifixes* disapproved of by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 170
- Crucifixion*, picture of, trampled by roughs, **ii.** 349; not allowed by Richmond Guardians, 477
- Cuddesdon Theological College*, **ii.** 34

CUN

- Cunningham* (Rev. J. W.), **i.** 285, 448; Editor of the *Christian Observer*, 517; biographical notice of him, 172
- Curtain*, red, objected to, **ii.** 202
- Cyril* (St.) of Jerusalem referred to, **ii.** 282
- DAILY PRAYERS* (public) inculcated in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 406; by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 185; usefulness of, questioned, 188
- Dale* (Rev. —), intruding clergyman at St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 337
- Dale* (Dean Thos.) begins and afterwards discontinues evening Communion, **ii.** 25
- Dale* (Rev. Thos.), **i.** 448
- Dale* (Rev. T. P.), **ii.** 413; imprisoned, 441; his property sequestered, 442; appeals and is released, 444; his living sequestered, *ib.*; his bill of costs, 445
- Dallas* (Rev. A. R. C.), **ii.** 284
- "*Dark*," a cant term, **i.** 369
- Darracott* (Rev. —), **i.** 151
- Dartmouth* (Lord), **i.** 136
- Dashwood* (Sir F.), **i.** 98
- Daubeny* (Archdeacon), **i.** 304
- Davenant* (Bishop), **i.** 79; at the Council of Dort. 80
- "*Dead Sec*," **ii.** 77
- Dealtry* (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 448
- Dean* (Wm.), nominal prosecutor of Mr. Green, **ii.** 418; payments demanded by, 421
- Deane* (Dr.), **ii.** 376
- Deans' Memorial* (the), **ii.** 429
- "*Decided*," a cant term, **i.** 369
- Decline* in Low-Church piety, &c., **i.** 356; **ii.** 193, 452
- De Coetlogon* (Rev. —), **i.** 139
- Defacing* of paintings in St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 337
- Delancy* (Mrs.), **i.** 243
- Delawarr* (Earl of), **i.** 505
- Delawarr* (Archdeacon) points out error of Exeter Synod, **ii.** 8; his independence in time of the Papal Aggression, **ii.** 17;

DIS

- works against Mr. Gladstone's election in 1853, 31; anticipates attack on Eucharistic doctrine, 44; preaches on the Eucharist, 45; persecuted by the "Evangelical Alliance," 47; brings forward in Convocation a motion about Bishop Colenso, 156; gets up declaration about Athanasian Creed, 288; gets up memorial for toleration, **ii.** 430
- Denison* (Bishop), **i.** 313
- Departed*, state of, **i.** 249; prayer for, deemed by Zuinglians useless, 46; disapproved of by Grindal, 57; and by Low-Churchmen, 444; discussed in *Tracts for the Times*, 406; opposed by Bishop Longley, 484; Scriptural authority for, 485
- Deprivation* of Ritualists, "Church Association" Bill for, **ii.** 433
- Deverell* (John, Esq.) opens an Independent "chapel," **ii.** 245 (note.)
- "*Dialogues on Prophecy*," **i.** 310
- Dibdin* (Rev. R. W.), **ii.** 282
- "*Disciplina arcana*," **i.** 409
- Dishonesty* of Low-Church professions, **ii.** 245; Mr. Samuel Morley's speech about. 518
- Disinterestedness* of H. Venn the elder, **i.** 126
- Disraeli* (Mr., M.P.), political necessities of, **ii.** 252; his action about the Public Worship Regulation Bill, 306; (Earl of Beaconsfield) nominates Mr. Rowley Hill to the see of Sodor and Man. 371
- Dissent* sanctioned by H. Venn the elder, **i.** 128; fostered by Low-Churchmen, 355; influence of, on the Low-Church party, **ii.** 60; fraternising with, **ii.** 61, 245, 394; by Bishop Ryle and others, 448; Modern, a result of Low-Church teaching, 522
- Dissenters*, plot for comprehen-

DIT

- sion of, **ii.** 31; bill for admitting, to Anglican pulpits, 289; congregations of, **i.** 5
- Ditcher* (*Rev. Jos.*), **ii.** 46; nominal prosecutor of Archdeacon Denison, 47; appeals to Privy Council, 49
- Division* of services recommended, **ii.** 186; by Mr. Miller, 22
- Divisions* among Low-Churchmen **i.** 487
- Doctrines* of the Church of England, **i.** 2
- Dodd* (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 97; an admirer of Romaine, 110
- Doddridge* (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 222, 287; his *Rise and Progress*, 222; his works read by H. More, 243; his orthodox Communion-hymn, 263
- Dodescombe Leigh*, Sam. Walker curate of, **i.** 145
- Dodson* (*Sir J.*) decides against Mr. Ditcher, **ii.** 49
- Dodsworth* (*Rev. W.*), **ii.** 210
- Dogma*, Broad-Church dislike of, **ii.** 122
- "*Dolphin Society*" (Bristol), **ii.** 456
- Donau Moos*, spiritual manifestations at, **i.** 314
- Dorset* county meeting against Ritualism, **ii.** 228
- Dort*, Synod of, **i.** 80
- Douglas* (*Dean*), **ii.** 157
- Dream*, T. Robinson's, **i.** 154
- Drummond* (*Henry, M.P.*) holds meetings for discussion about Scripture, **i.** 310; whereat spiritual manifestations, 335; anecdote of him and Mr. McNeile, 446
- Drummond* (*Rev. D. T. K.*), **i.** 493; his conventicle, 494; Mr. Bickersteth preaches in it, 496
- Drypool*, H. Venn (the younger) vicar of, **ii.** 291
- Dunbar* (*Rev. Sir William, Bart.*) excommunicated by Bishop William Skinner, **i.** 495; Mr. Bickersteth preaches in his conventicle, 496

ELL

- Dunstan's* (*St.*), *Fleet St.*, H. Venn (the younger) curate of, **ii.** 290
- Du Pin*, **i.** 88
- "*Durham Letter*," **ii.** 14
- Durnford* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 401
- Dwight* (*Rev. Dr.*) and the *Christian Observer*, **ii.** 61
- Dykes* (*Rev. Dr.*), **ii.** 330
- EARNESTNESS* of Low-Church preachers, **i.** 258
- Ebury* (*Lord*), President of the Prayer-book Revision Society, **ii.** 93; presents petition against Mr. Bryan King, 113; his bill for revision of Prayer-book, 428
- Ecclesiological Society*, **i.** 481
- "*Eclectic Society*," **i.** 267
- Eden* (*Canon*), a writer in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 404
- Edouart* (*Rev. A. G.*), **ii.** 55
- Education* (Low-Church) of children, **i.** 373
- Edward VI.*, his First Prayer-book, **i.** 396; his Second Prayer-book, *ib.*; his threat of enforcing Zuinglianism, 13
- Edwards* (*President*) on the affections, **i.** 201, 226
- Edwards* (*Rev. John*), vicar of Prestbury, **ii.** 299; his antecedents, *ib.*; his work at Prestbury, 301; proceedings against him, 301, 372; takes the name of Baghot-de-la-Bere, 435; second suit against him, 435, 436; his letter to Archbishop Tait, 437; his appeal, 439; disallowed, 440; resigns, *ib.*
- Election*, T. Scott's sermon on, **i.** 188
- Eliot* (*Dean*), removes statues from Bristol Cathedral, **ii.** 331; addresses the Congregational Union, 450; lived in retirement, and why, 457
- Eliot* (*Mr.*), **i.** 238
- Elland Society*, **i.** 202
- Ellicott* (*Rev. C. J.*), Dean of Exeter, **ii.** 77; Bishop of

ELL

- Gloucester and Bristol, 74 ; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155 ; his action about the Society of the Holy Cross and *The Priest in Absolution*, 363 ; his conduct towards Mr. Ward, 408 ; his plan of procedure towards refractory Ritualists, 435
- Elliot (Mr.)*, a Jacobite, **i.** 110
- Elliot (John)*, breaks up confessional at St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 347
- Elliott (Rev. H. V.)*, **ii.** 179
- Elliott (W. J.)*, **ii.** 400
- Elphinstone (Colonel)*, nominal prosecutor of Mr. Purchas, **ii.** 263 ; his decease, 268
- Elwin (Rev. F.)*, **i.** 360
- Elwin (Rev. W.)*, **ii.** 472
- Ember-seasons*, observance of, urged by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 185
- English Church Union* gets up declaration about the Athanasian Creed, **ii.** 288 ; fails to induce "Church Association" to join in protest against the Bordesley sacrilege, 469 ; obtains Mr. Enraght's release, 472 ; further help given by, 473
- Enraght (Rev. R. W.)*, **ii.** 458 ; charges against, 460, 464 ; inhibited by Lord Penzance, 470 ; imprisoned, 471 ; released, 473 ; his licence withdrawn, 474 ; leaves the parish, *ib.*
- Episcopacy*, Divine appointment of, maintained by Bancroft, **i.** 77
- Erastianism* of Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 166
- Erle (Sir William)*, **ii.** 83, 253
- Errors*, positive Low-Church, **i.** 376
- "*Essays and Reviews*," **ii.** 130
- Eucharist*, how celebrated in 18th century, **i.** 92 ; how celebrated by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 501

FIE

- "*Evangelical Alliance*," **i.** 489 ; name of a society which prosecuted Archdeacon Denison, **ii.** 47
- Evangelical Principles*, association for maintaining, **ii.** 49
- Evening Communion*, **ii.** 24, 189 ; commonness of, **ii.** 501
- Exeter Hall*, preachings at, **ii.** 55 ; diminished attendance at meetings there, 453
- Exeter Synod*, see *Synod*
- Exiles at Frankfort*, quarrel among, **i.** 66
- Extempore preaching*, **i.** 373 ; deprecated by H. Martyn's hearers, 259
- Eyre (Rev. J.)*, **i.** 277, 278
- FAIRFOUL (Archbishop)*, consecration of, **i.** 491
- "*Faithful*," cant term, **i.** 369
- Falschood* circulated by the "Church Association," **ii.** 392, 397 ; told by Mr. Enraght's persecutors, 465
- Families*, breaking-up of, **ii.** 206
- Family religion* of H. Venn the elder, **i.** 125
- Fasting* disliked by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 207 ; benefits of, taught in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 404
- Fathers (early Christian)* read by L. Richmond, **i.** 298
- "*Fathers (The) of the English Church*," edited by L. Richmond, **i.** 303
- Faulkener (Rev. R. R.)*, **i.** 480
- Fausett (Rev. Dr.)*, **i.** 460
- Feelings (right)*, Daniel Wilson to pray for, **i.** 278
- Fell (Rev. F.)*, **i.** 465
- Fénelon*, **i.** 243
- Ferrar*, his establishment at Little Gidding, **ii.** 27
- Ferrières (Baron de)*, **ii.** 301
- Fever Hospital*, Islington, **ii.** 200
- Field (Mr. Justice)*, **ii.** 444

FIT

- Fitzgerald* (*Right Hon. A.*), **ii.** 464
- Fitzroy* (*Rev. E. J. A.*), **ii.** 479
- Flamank* (*Thomas*), **ii.** 249
- Fletcher* (*Rev. J.*), **i.** 102, **ii.** 64; dislikes the baptismal service, 89
- Forsyth* (*Mr., M.P.*), **ii.** 364
- Foster* (*Rev. J.*), **i.** 278
- Fowler* (*H. T.*), **ii.** 353
- Fox* (*Charles*), **i.** 98
- Foxe*, **i.** 66; receives narratives from Grindal, **i.** 55; advises the doctoring of certain documents, 70; his *Acts and Monuments*, 66, 70; his opinions, 68
- Frankfort*, exiles at, **i.** 66
- Fraser* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 401; applied to for a new Bishop of Natal, 170; rebukes Low-Church memorialists, 418; allows Mr. Green's prosecution, 420; applies for his release, 434
- Frederick William IV.* (*King*) helps to found Jerusalem bishopric, **i.** 452
- "*Free Churches*," **i.** 245
- Free will* denied by Zuinglians, **i.** 46
- Froude* (*Hurrell*) on the Tractarian Committee, 403; wrote in *Tracts for the Times*, 404
- "*Fruits of Philosophy* (*The*)," **ii.** 364
- Fry* (*Churchwarden*), **ii.** 338; broke up a side-altar, 339; his disorderly conduct in church, 341; institutes proceedings for defacing church, 348; heads roughs in school-room, 349
- Fry* (*Rev. T.*), **i.** 299
- Fulford* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 155
- Fuller* (*Dr. Thomas*), **i.** 79
- Funerals* in the 18th century, **i.** 96
- Funeral sermons*, **ii.** 190
- Fust* (*Sir Herbert Jenner*), judgment of, about St. Sepulchre's altar, **i.** 481; in the Gorham Case, **ii.** 3 (see also *Jenner*)

GOI

- GALLERY* in Blackfriars Church, **i.** 107; in Olney Church, 137; in St. Martin's, Leicester, 159
- Gambling* in the 18th century, **i.** 98
- Garbett* (*Archdeacon*), elected Professor of Poetry, **i.** 456; his Bampton Lectures, 440
- Garbett* (*Canon*) abuses the S.P.C.K., **ii.** 372
- Gardiner* (*Bishop*), his answer to Crammer, **i.** 16
- Gardiner* (*Colonel*), his life read by Newton, **i.** 133
- Gardiner* (*Samuel*), **ii.** 332
- Gardner* (*Rev. H.*), **ii.** 353
- Garriek*, **i.** 243
- Gateshead*, vestry meeting at, **ii.** 217
- Gee* (*Rev. Dr.*), **ii.** 336
- Gell* (*Rev. P.*), **ii.** 95
- Geneva Version* of the Bible, **i.** 60
- George's* (*St.*) in the East, **ii.** 101; Rev. Bryan King rector of, 102
- Gibson* (*Bishop*), **i.** 111
- Gifts* (*spiritual*) despised by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 333.
- Gilbert* (*Bishop*), 456; inhibits Mr. Neale, 506; ceases to support the E. Grinstead Sisters, **ii.** 68; his conduct in the Lavington Case, 80; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Coleuso, **ii.** 155
- Gilpin* (*Rev. Bernard*), **i.** 103
- Girdlestone* (*Canon*), interview of, with Congregational Union, **ii.** 450; refuses Mr. Randall the pulpit of Bristol Cathedral, 457
- Girdlestone* (*Rev. R. B.*), **ii.** 386
- Glennel* (*Lord*), **ii.** 173
- Glover* (*Ven. E.*), **ii.** 355, 397
- Glyn* (*Rev. C. J.*), **ii.** 91
- Goad* (*Rev. Dr.*) at the Synod of Dort, **i.** 80
- Gobat* (*Bishop*), **i.** 501; preaches in schismatical congregations, **ii.** 40; upheld by Archbishop Sumner, 41
- Going* (*Rev. J.*), **ii.** 398

GOL

- Golightly* (*Rev. C. P.*) interferes in Lavington Case (?), **ii.** 82; attacks Cuddesdon College teaching, 85; requests Professor Jowett's renewed subscription to Articles, 128
- Goode* (*Rev. F.*), **i.** 420
- Goode* (*Rev. W.*) on modern claims to spiritual gifts, **i.** 337; his *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*, 440; Editor of *Christian Observer*, 482; against symbolism, *ib.*; criticises Bishop Philpott's letter to Archbishop Sumner, **ii.** 7; his opinion on the revival of Convocation, 19; Dean of Ripon, 77
- Good Friday*, observance of, **i.** 352; three hours' service protested against, **ii.** 453
- Goodwin* (*Bishop H.*), **ii.** 395
- Goodwin* (*C. W.*), contributor to *Essays and Reviews*, **ii.** 139
- Gorham* (*Rev. G. C.*), **ii.** 2
- Gosfield*, *Rev. C.* Bridges curate of, **ii.** 283
- Goundry* (*Rev. —*), **ii.** 394
- "*Gracious*," cant term, **i.** 369.
- Grafton* (*Duke of*), **i.** 98
- Graham* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 155
- Grant*, (*Charles, Esq.*), **i.** 237, 238, 285, 345
- Grant* (*Sir Robert*), **ii.** 172
- Granville* (*Rev. A. K. B.*), **ii.** 331
- "*Grateful*" Society (*Bristol*), **ii.** 456
- Gray* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 152; consults Archbishop Longley about Bishop Colenso, 153; cites Bishop Colenso to answer charges, 157; presides at trial, 160; deposes Colenso, 161; excommunicates him, 163; line taken by Low-Churchmen in regard hereof, 165
- Gray* (*Sheriff*), **ii.** 424
- Green* (*Bishop*), **i.** 136
- Green* (*Rev. S. F.*), **ii.** 417; memorial against him, 418; prosecuted, *ib.*; admonished,

HAN

- 420; inhibited, *ib.*; bill of costs, 421-3; imprisoned, 424; bailiffs in his house, 425; sale of his goods, 426; Low-Church comments thereon, 427; agitation for his release, 432; resigns, 434; is released, 435
- Greening*, a persecutor of Mr. Enraght, **ii.** 458
- Greenwell* (*Rev. H.*), **ii.** 330
- Gregg* (*Rev. Dr.*), **ii.** 328
- Gregorian chants* advocated, **ii.** 186
- Grey* (*Hon. and Rev. F. R.*), **ii.** 230
- Grey* (*Sir George*), **ii.** 31
- Griffiths* (*Rev. J.*), **i.** 427
- Grimshawe* (*Rev. T. S.*), **i.** 175
- Grindal* (*Archbishop*), **i.** 49, 54; his injunction about old altarcloths and chalices, 15; his appointment to York, 48
- Grove* (*Mr. Justice*), **ii.** 425
- Grove* (*Sir T. F., Burt.*), **ii.** 400
- Grove* (*W. J.*), **ii.** 400
- Guarantee Fund* of the "Church Association," **ii.** 228
- "*Guardian*" newspaper, **ii.** 205
- Gunston* (*R.*), **ii.** 332
- Gurney* (*Rev. J. H.*), **i.** 211
- Gurney* (*Rt. Hon. Russell*), **ii.** 307
- HAINES* (*Rev. —*), **i.** 158
- Hall* (*Bishop*), **i.** 80, 243
- Hall* (*Rev. Richard*), **i.** 145
- Hall* (*Rev. Robert*), **i.** 285
- Hamilton* (*Bishop James*), 491
- Hamilton* (*Bishop W. K.*) prosecutes Dr. Rowland Williams, **ii.** 147; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155; his visitation charge, 239
- Hampden* (*Bishop*) appointed to the see of Hereford, **i.** 502; his invalid election, 504; is consecrated, *ib.*
- Handsard* (*Rev. —*), **ii.** 111
- Hannen* (*Sir James*), **ii.** 325, 384

HAR

- Harcourt (Archbishop)*, **i.** 452
Harcourt (Sir W. Vernon), **ii.** 306
Hardy (Mr. Gathorne, M.P.), **ii.** 307
Hare (Archdeacon), **ii.** 122
Harris (James), **ii.** 319
Harris (Thomas), **ii.** 458
Harrison, (Archdeacon), **i.** 404
Harrow, Rev. J. W. Cunningham vicar of, **ii.** 173
Harrowby (Earl of), **ii.** 370
Hastings (Warren), **i.** 99
Hatherley (Lord Chancellor), **ii.** 269, 272
Hawkins (Provost) taught Newman the use of Scripture, **i.** 400; helps to suspend Dr. Pusey, 460
Healing of Margaret Macdonald, **i.** 319; of Mary Campbell, *ib.*; of Miss Fancourt, 326
Hearitree, ferments in, **i.** 470
Hebbert (Mr.), **ii.** 268
Heber (Bishop), **ii.** 59, 60
Herbert (George), **i.** 424
Hervey, his *Meditations*, **i.** 133; his *Theron and Aspasio*, 155, 287
Heurtley (Professor), **ii.** 48
Heywood (Sir T. Percival, Bart.), **ii.** 417, 434
Hibbert (Mr.), **ii.** 73
Higgins (Bishop), **ii.** 155
 "High-Church," origin of the term, **i.** 2
Highclere, Mr. Dallas curate of, **ii.** 284
Hillyard (Rev. James), **ii.** 114
Hill (Bishop Rowley), **ii.** 371
Hill (Mr. Justice), **ii.** 83
Hill (Rev. John), **i.** 341; **ii.** 181
Hill (Rev. Rowland), **ii.** 245
Hinchliffe (Bishop), **i.** 156, 201, 210
Hind (Rev. C.), **ii.** 451
Hinton Martel, Rev. C. Bridges rector of, **ii.** 283
Hoadly (Bishop), **i.** 88
Hodson (Rev. C. E.), **ii.** 312
Holland (Rev. E.), **ii.** 464
Holloway (Mr.), **ii.** 338
Holy Cross (Society of the), **ii.**

HYM

- 357; its nature and constitution, 360; spoken against by Lord Redesdale, 361; and in the House of Commons, 363
HOLY GHOST, Rev. H. Stewart urges prayer for revival of His work, **i.** 307
Holy Trinity Church, Bordesley, **ii.** 458
Homilies (the), **i.** 417
Hook (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 453
 "Hookerite," term claimed by *Christian Observer*, **i.** 276
Hooper (Bishop), **i.** 36; how regarded by Low-Churchmen, 449; character of his dispute about vestments, 10; his visitation-book, 15; his opinions, 38; his directions as to the Communion, 60
Hopkins, **i.** 243
Horne (Bishop of Winchester), **i.** 56
Horne (Rev. T. Hartwell), **i.** 448
Horsley (Rev. J. W.), **ii.** 365
Horwood (J.), **ii.** 414
Host, profanation of a consecrated, **i.** 513
Howard (—), complains against Mr. Glover, **ii.** 397
Howard (Rev. H. St. John), **ii.** 448 (note)
Howe, Puritan divine, 243
Howels (Rev. —), **i.** 419
Howley (Archbishop), **i.** 452
Hubbard (Hon. J. G.), founder of St. Alban's, Holborn, **ii.** 236; supports Deprivation Bill, 433
Huddleston (J.), **ii.** 395
Hudson (Robert), **ii.** 332
Hughes (Mr. Thomas), **ii.** 289
Humphreys (Dr.), **i.** 53; teaches Puritanism at Oxford, 74
Huntingdon (Countess of), **i.** 101; her chapel in London, 139
Hurford (—), **ii.** 395
Hymnals, Kemble's, **ii.** 505; Mercer's 508; Olney, **i.** 261 (see *Olney Hymns*)
Hymnody, **i.** 261; controversy about, 309

HYM

- Hymns*, introduction of, **i.** 261; opposition to, 156-7; unsuitable, 262
 "Hymns Ancient and Modern" objected to by "Church Pastoral Aid Society," **ii.** 455
- IDOLATRY*, Earl of Shaftesbury's idea of, **i.** 6 (note); **ii.** 497
- Ignorance* in T. Scott, **i.** 385; in Simeon, *ib.*; in Joseph Milner, 386; in Low-Churchmen, 371; of Scripture, **i.** 392, **ii.** 39; of theology, **ii.** 192
- Imprisonment* of Mr. Tooth, **ii.** 336; of Mr. Green, 424; of Mr. Dale, 441; of Mr. Enraght, 471
- Improvements* effected by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 350; **ii.** 185
- Incendiarism*, **ii.** 477; attempted, 423
- Independents*, spiritual manifestations among, **i.** 335
- Indolence*, spiritual, **i.** 363
- Inefficiency* of Low-Church clergymen, **ii.** 452, 499
- Infallibility*, Low-Church assumption of, **ii.** 399
- Inglis* (*Sir Robert*), **i.** 238
- Innes* (*Rev. W.*), **i.** 489
- Inscriptions* at St. Saviour's, Leeds, **i.** 483
- Inskip* (*Mr.*), **ii.** 410
- Inspiration*, verbal, **i.** 377; bad effects of the doctrine, 379
- Interpolation* by Privy Council, **ii.** 272
- Intolerance* shown by Archbishop Sandys, **i.** 50; by a Mr. Lovell, **ii.** 476; by the Richmond Guardians, 477
- Intoning* Divine Service, desirableness of, **ii.** 186
- Inverness*, foundation of Cathedral at, laid by Archbishop Longley, **i.** 498
- Invocation* at commencement of sermon, **ii.** 230
- "*Irish Brigade*" at Liverpool, **ii.** 479
- Irish Church*, disestablishment of, **ii.** 286; its results, *ib.*

JAM

- Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics* (*Society for*), **i.** 513
- "*Irish Fever*," conduct of Low-church clergy in, **i.** 504
- Irish Society*, **i.** 292
- Irons* (*Rev. E. A.*), **ii.** 353
- Irreverence* at Exeter Hall, **ii.** 55
- Irving* (*Rev. E.*), **i.** 293, 325, 333
- "*Irvingism*," rise of, **i.** 314; more dangerous than Plymouthism, **ii.** 510
- Islington clergy*, insubordination of, **i.** 466
- Islington Clerical Meeting*, **i.** 351, **ii.** 513
- Islington Missionary College*, **i.** 311, 515
- Islington Protestant Institute*, **ii.** 517
- Ives* (*Rev. J.*), **ii.** 484
- JACKSON* (—), **ii.** 472
- Jackson* (*Bishop*) attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, **ii.** 154; succeeds Dr. Tait as Bishop of London, 250; hears appeal in Purchas Case, 269; hears Mr. Purchas's petition, 272; refuses to license members of the Holy Cross Society, 377; refers complaints against Mr. Lowder to Archbishop Tait, 392; allows Mr. Mackonochie to continue working in the diocese, 488; lectured by the "Church Association," 490
- Jacob* (*Archdeacon*), **ii.** 228
- James* (*Lord Justice*), **ii.** 272; his change of opinion about the Eucharistic vestments, 327; hears appeal in the Mackonochie Case, 382; in Mr. Dale's and Mr. Enraght's, 444
- James* (*Rev. J. Angell*), **i.** 489
- James* (*Rev. W.*), **i.** 400
- James* (*Sir H.*), **ii.** 433
- James* (*Sir W. M.*), **ii.** 324
- James's* (*St.*), Brighton, served by Dr. Marsh, **ii.** 177; bought by Mr. Purchas, 262

JAM

- James's (St.), Exeter*, ferments in, **i.** 470
James's (St.), Hatcham, **ii.** 331; riots in, 334; closed by the Bishop, 336
Jansenists, **i.** 243
Jelf (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 460
Jenkins (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 460
Jenkins (Mr.), refused communion by Mr. Cook, **ii.** 313
Jenks, Devotions by, **i.** 180
Jermyn (Bishop), **ii.** 59
Jerusalem, Anglican bishopric at, **i.** 452
Jessel (Sir George), **ii.** 440
Jeune (Bishop), **ii.** 77, 164
Jeune (Mr.), **ii.** 382, 383
Jewel (Bishop), **i.** 51
Jews (the), London Society for Promoting Christianity among, see *London Society*
Jews, love for the, **i.** 389
Jobson (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 155
John's (St.), Bedford Row, orderliness at, **i.** 173; attended by H. Venn the younger, **ii.** 290
John's (St.) Hall, London, **ii.** 174
John's (St.), Holloway, H. Venn (the younger) incumbent of, **ii.** 291
John's (St.), Miles Platting, attempt at burning, **ii.** 423
Johnson (Dean), **ii.** 48
Johnson (Dr.), **i.** 243
Jolley (Rev. W. R.), **ii.** 495
Jones (F. E.), a spy, **ii.** 384
Jones (Rev. T. B.), **ii.** 246
Jones (Sir W.), **i.** 243
Josephus read in Greek by T. Scott, **i.** 179
Jowett (Prof.), renews subscription to XXXIX. Articles, **ii.** 126; contributes to *Essays and Reviews*, 143; suppresses Apostles' Creed in College Chapel, 288
Jubilee of the "Church Missionary Society," **i.** 514
Jude's (St.), Liverpool, rioting in, **ii.** 479
Judging of others by Low-

LAN

- Churchmen, **i.** 388; right of, claimed by Low-Churchmen, 359
Julias (Dr.), **ii.** 406

KEBLE (Rev. J.), his assize sermon, **i.** 398; his *Christian Year*, 401; on the Tractarian Committee, 403; writes in *Tracts for the Times*, *ib.*; writes to Bishop Gray about Low-Church support, **ii.** 169
Keene (Bishop), **i.** 156
Kelly (Sir Fitzroy), **ii.** 324; dissents from the Ridsdale Judgment, 326
Kemble's hymn-book, **ii.** 505
Kempis (St. Thos. à), read by Newton, **i.** 131
Kennicott (Dr.), **i.** 243
Kerr (Mr. Commissioner), **ii.** 347
Kilndown, surpliced choir at, **i.** 511
King (Rev. Bryan), **ii.** 102
Kingsley (Rev. C.), his different attitudes towards Tractarianism, **i.** 428 (note); his exposition of Abraham's hope, **ii.** 119; Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, 124
Kinnaird (Baron), **ii.** 464
Kinnaird (Mr. A.), **ii.** 47
Kinnaird (Hon. A.), **ii.** 245
Kirke White, **i.** 192
Knight (—), **ii.** 401
Knight-Bruce (Sir J.), **ii.** 5
Knight (Rev. W.) quoted, **i.** 367
Knox (Bishop), **ii.** 155
Knox (John), **i.** 67

LAMBERT (Sir Danl.), **i.** 103
 "Lambeth Articles," **i.** 59
Langdale (Lord), **ii.** 5, 6
Langdon (Rev. C.), **ii.** 47
Language used by Bishop Bale, **i.** 43; by Zuinglian preachers, 60; by Dr. McNeile and Orangemen, **ii.** 478
Lanivery, S. Walker vicar of, **i.** 145

LAT

- Latimer (Bishop)*, his opinions, **i.** 31
Laud (Archbishop), **i.** 74, 397, **ii.** 51; his lectures at Oxford, **i.** 81
 "Laudean," title refused by *Christian Observer*, **i.** 477
Laurence's (St.), Reading, W. Marsh curate of, **ii.** 176
Laurencekirk, Convocation at, **i.** 497
Lavington Case, **ii.** 80
Law (Dean), **ii.** 372
Law (Rev. W.), his *Serious Call*, **i.** 102
Layman (Mr.), **ii.** 342
Lea (Rev. G.), **ii.** 464
Learning (theological) depreciated by H. Venn the elder, **i.** 385; by R. Cecil, 386
Lee (Bishop Prince), **ii.** 155; refuses to inhibit Bp. Colenso, 156
 "Legal," cant term, **i.** 369
Leigh (Rev. J. E. A.), **ii.** 73
Leigh (Rt. Hon. Pemberton), **ii.** 5, 52
Leighton (Archbishop.) **i.** 491
Lennox (Lord H.), **ii.** 307
Lent noticed by E. Bickersteth, **i.** 287
Letters (anonymous), see *Anonymous Letters*
 "Leuconomus" i.e. Whitfield, **i.** 143
Lewis (Bishop), **ii.** 246
Lewis (Sir G. C., Bart.), **ii.** 109, 110
Libellous statements by Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 197
Liberality of H. Thornton, **i.** 238
Liddell (Hon. and Rev. R.), proceeded against for church ornaments, **ii.** 51; *Liddell v. Beal*, **ii.** 253
Liddon (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 288
Life (spiritual) hindered by preaching for a Low-Church Society, **ii.** 516
Lightfoot (Bishop), **ii.** 384
Lincolphshire, baptismal usage in, **ii.** 90
Lindley (Mr. Justice), **ii.** 425
Lindsay (Bishop), **i.** 455

LOW

- Littledale (Rev. Dr.)*, letter from, **ii.** 271 (note)
Liturgies (ancient), **i.** 405
Liverpool, conference at, on Christian union, **i.** 488; Church congress at, **ii.** 285
Lloyd (Mr. Morgan), **ii.** 433
Lloyd (Rev. —), Rector of St. Dunstan's, Fleet St., **ii.** 290
Lloyd (S. S., Esq.), **ii.** 464
Lock Hospital, **i.** 139, 299; T. Scott's engagements at, 186
London, Newton's account of religion in, **i.** 138
London City Mission, **ii.** 197
London College of Divinity, **ii.** 174
London Missionary Society, **i.** 268
London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, **i.** 279, 303; supported by Legh Richmond, **i.** 303; by H. V. Elliott, **ii.** 180; finances of, about 1882, **ii.** 503; work of, *ib.*
Long Acre Chapel, T. Scott's engagements at, **i.** 187
Longley (Bishop) objects to inscriptions at St. Saviour's, Leeds, **i.** 483; inhibits Mr. Beckett, **ii.** 18; (Abp.) lays foundation of Inverness Cathedral, 498; attends meeting of bishops about Bp. Colenso, **ii.** 154
Lords (House of) appealed to in Mackonochie Case, **ii.** 384; and by Mr. Green, 426
Lot (the), Mr. Bridges on the use of, **ii.** 194, note.
Lovel (—), proposals of, for punishing Ritualists, **ii.** 476
 "Low-Church," origin of the term, **i.** 2
Low-Church Party, out of what materials formed, **i.** 83; its position historical, 87; piety its early characteristic, 129; Erastianism of, **ii.** 166
Low-Church System opposed to church principles, **i.** 141; attacked in *Tracts for the Times*, 414

LOW

Low-Church work, results of, **i.** 350; **ii.** 184
Lowder (Rev. C.), **ii.** 387; Mr. Vatcher's attempt against him fails, 355; other attempts against him, 389; complaints against him, 391, stopped by Abp. Tait, 392
Lowe (Mr.), **ii.** 307
Lowth (Bishop), **i.** 243
Lucy (Sir Thos.), **i.** 66
Lukewarmness of Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 194
Lush (Mr. Justice), **ii.** 346
Lushington (Rt. Hon. Dr.), **ii.** 5; sits with Abp. Sumner in Archd. Denison's case, 48; his judgment on the Knights-bridge churches, 52; on Dr. R. Williams and Mr. H. B. Wilson, 149, reversed by the Privy Council, 150; hears *Martin v. Mackonochie*, 239
Lutheran missionaries employed, **i.** 271
Lutz (Roman Catholic priest), **i.** 315
Lyne (Rev. C. R. N.) sent to intrude at Prestbury, **ii.** 374, 376
 "Lyra Apostolica," **i.** 424

MACARTNEY (Lord), **i.** 243
Macaulay (Lord), quoted, **ii.** 478
Macaulay (Zachary), **i.** 239
McBean (Rev. —), intruding clergyman at St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 343
Macbride (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 126
McCaul (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 156
McClure (Mr.), **ii.** 346
McColl (Rev. Malcolm), **ii.** 349
Macdonald (Jas. and Geo.), **i.** 316
Macdonald (Margaret), **i.** 319
Macfarlyen (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 450
Macgregor (John, Esq.), nonsense by, **ii.** 202
MacKarness (Bishop), **ii.** 305; and Dr. Julius, 406
McKenna (Sir J.), **ii.** 433
Mackonochie (Rev. A. H.) prosecuted, **ii.** 236; obeys judgment, 254; submits to suspension, 256; and to a

MAR

second suspension, 310; suspended by Lord Penzance, 379; the sentence quashed, *ib.*; renewed, 382; third suit against him, *ib.*; heard by Lord Penzance, 383; Abp. Tait's last letter to him, 486; resigns St. Alban's, *ib.*; vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks, 487; deprived by Lord Penzance, 488; resigns, *ib.*; curate of St. Alban's, *ib.*
Maclagan (Bishop), **ii.** 354, 384, 398, 499
McMullen (Rev. J. A.), **ii.** 455
McNeile (Rev. Hugh), **i.** 335; would make receiving confession a capital offence, **ii.** 18; his influence at Liverpool, **ii.** 479; allusion to, by Lord Macaulay, (478, note); anecdote of him and Mr. Drummond, **i.** 446; the "great and good" Dean of Ripon, **ii.** 251; refuses fellowship with Mr. Mackonochie, 285
Maevorie (Bishop), consecration of, **ii.** 165
Magee (Archbishop), **i.** 455
Magniac (Mr.), **ii.** 433
Maguire (Rev. R.), **ii.** 517
 "Maintenance," offence committed by "Church Association," **ii.** 355
Maitland (Brownlow), **ii.** 372
Maitland (Rev. S. R.), **i.** 206
Manchester and Salford Protestant Association, **ii.** 183
Manisty (Mr. Justice), **ii.** 444
Manners (Lord John), **ii.** 307
Manning (Rev. H. E.), afterwards Cardinal, **i.** 404
Manning (Owen), **i.** 112
Mansfield (Earl of), **i.** 105
Mant on Baptism, **i.** 291
March (Lord), **i.** 98
Margaret's (St.), *Lothbury*, T. Scott's engagements at, **i.** 186
Markfield Church served by R. Cecil, **i.** 173
Marriage with an unbaptized person, **ii.** 191
Marsh (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 342; biographical notice of, **ii.** 175

MAR

- Martin (John)*, Mr. Mackonochie's nominal prosecutor, **ii.** 238; institutes a second suit, 309; his name used in a third, 382; difference between him and "Church Association," 384
- Martin* (Lincolnshire), T. Scott's first curacy, **i.** 178
- Martin* (*Rev.* —), **ii.** 394
- Martin's* (*St.*), *Liverpool*, **ii.** 112
- "*Martyrs' Memorial Church*," **ii.** 289
- Mary's* (*St.*), *Brighton*, *Rev. H. V. Elliott* incumbent of, **ii.** 180
- Mary's* (*St.*) *Hall*, *Brighton*, **ii.** 180
- Mary's* (*St.*) *Hall*, *Cheltenham*, **i.** 486, **ii.** 297
- Mary's* (*St.*), *Leamington*, *Dr. Marsh* incumbent of, **ii.** 178
- Mary's* (*St.*)-*le-Strand*, **ii.** 445
- Maskell* (*Rev. W.*), **i.** 509
- "*Mass* (the) in masquerade," **ii.** 306
- Matthew's* (*St.*), *Fell St.*, **ii.** 112
- Matthew's* (*St.*), *Smethwick*, **ii.** 353
- Matthias* (*St.*), *Stoke Newington*, **ii.** 231
- Maule* (*Sir W. H.*), **ii.** 52
- Maurice* (*Rev. F. D.*), **ii.** 124; incumbent of *St. Peter's*, *Vere St.*, 129
- May Meetings*, **i.** 293
- Mayne* (*Rev. C. O.*), **ii.** 47
- Mayne* (*Sir R.*), **ii.** 109
- Mayor* (*Rev. J.*), **i.** 192
- "*Means of Grace*" according to *H. Venn* the elder, **i.** 127
- Medmenham Abbey*, **i.** 98
- Meetings*, *May*, **i.** 293; missionary, at *Hull*, 294
- Melcombe-Regis Church*, defective design for, **i.** 483 (note); *Rev. C. Bridges* rector of, **ii.** 283
- Mellish* (*Lord Justice*), **ii.** 270, 272
- Mellor* (*Mr. Justice*), **ii.** 346
- Memorial* of 21 Anglican priests, **ii.** 228
- Memorials* (*Low-Church*), to *Archbishop Sumner* against

MOB

- Tractarianism*, **i.** 510; to the *Queen* against *Tractarianism*, 511; to *Bishop Jacobson* against *Ritualism*, **ii.** 226; attempted by *Archdeacon Jacob*, 228; to *Bishop Hamilton* against doctrines in his charge, 241; against *Mr. Hodson*, 312; against eastward position and *Eucharistic vestments*, 313; against *Cuddesdon College*, 382; against *Mr. Green*, 418; against ritual, 430, 431
- Merchant Seamen's Bible Society*, **i.** 292
- Merriman* (*Archdeacon*), **ii.** 157
- Methodism*, rise of, **i.** 101; unscriptural peculiarities of, opposed by *S. Walker*, 151
- Methodists*, "Independent," **i.** 139
- Mildred's* (*St.*), *Bread St.*, *T. Scott* lecturer at, **i.** 186
- Miles* (*Rev. R.*), founder of *St. Raphael's*, *Bristol*, **ii.** 409
- Millar* (*Rev. J. L.*), **i.** 335
- Millennium* (the), disputes about, **i.** 310
- Miller* (*George*), **ii.** 319
- Miller* (*Rev. J. C.*) recommends division of services, **ii.** 22; withdraws from the *S.P.C.K.*, 372; his sympathy with *Dissenters*, 451
- Milner* (*Dean*), **i.** 200, 220; **ii.** 290
- Milner* (*Rev. Joseph*), **i.** 204, 220; his *Church history*, 202, 205
- Milton* (*Rev. W.*), **ii.** 213 (note)
- Ministry* (the *Christian*), *Low-Church* ideas about, **i.** 288
- Miraeles* (alleged), *Low-Church* action regarding, **i.** 330
- Misrepresentation* of *Archbishop Parker* by *Puritans*, **i.** 47; of facts by *Low-Churchmen*, **ii.** 71, 224
- Mission* in *London*, 1869, *Low-Church* action regarding, **ii.** 285
- Mob* in *St. George's-in-the-East*, **ii.** 105; in *St. James's*, *Hatcham*, 334; in *Prestbury Church*, 375; threatened visit of, to *St. Peter's*, *London*

MOB

- Docks, 390; sent to Prestbury Church again, 437
- Mobbing* of the Rev. A. Courtenay, **i.** 470; of the Rev. J. Armstrong, 471; of other clergymen, 513; of a Sister's funeral at Lewes, **ii.** 50; of the clergy of St. George's-in-the-East, 106, &c.; of the Rev. J. B. Pollock, 219; of the Rev. E. J. A. Fitzroy, **ii.** 479
- Moberly* (*Bishop*), opposes the Public Worship Regulation Bill, **ii.** 305; refuses to allow prosecution of Mr. Chapman, 400
- Molony* (*Rev. C. W.*), **ii.** 478
- Molyneux* (*Rev. C.*), **ii.** 370
- Moody and Sankey* (*Messrs.*), **ii.** 451
- Moore* (—), Master of Hull Grammar School, **i.** 200
- Moore* (*Proctor*), **ii.** 373
- Moore and Cuncy* (*Messrs.*) refuse to apply for significavit against Mr. Dale, **ii.** 441
- "*Morality of the Sabbath*," **i.** 254
- Moravian missions* supported by Dean Milner, **i.** 204, 271
- More* (*Hannah*), **i.** 99, 238, 240, 343, 368; her *Practical Piety*, 280
- Morley* (*R. G.*), **ii.** 414
- Morley* (*Samuel, M.P.*) on Low-Church dishonesty, **ii.** 518
- "*Morning Watch*," letter to Editor of, **i.** 325 (note)
- Mortimer* (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 448
- Mosley* (*Rev. T.*), **ii.** 178
- "*Mother of God*," title refused by Low-Churchmen to the B.V.M., **i.** 384
- Motto* of Low-Church party, what it might have been, **i.** 129
- Moule* (*Rev. H. C.*), **ii.** 386
- Murray* (*Bishop*), **i.** 455
- Musgrave* (*Archbishop*), **ii.** 5
- Music* in parks on Sundays forbidden, **ii.** 37

NAPIER (*Sir Joseph*), **ii.** 244

Nares (*Captain, R.N.*), **ii.** 311

NOW

- Neale* (*Rev. J. M.*), **i.** 505; complained of, **ii.** 68; inhibited by Bishop Gilbert, **i.** 506
- "*Neo-Evangelicals*," **ii.** 454, 513
- Nettlebed*, W. Marsh incumbent of, **ii.** 76
- Newey* (*John*), **ii.** 472
- Newfoundland School Society*, **i.** 293; amalgamates with the Colonial Church and School Society, **ii.** 18
- Newman* (*Rev. J. H.*, afterwards *Cardinal*), how he became a High-Churchman, **ii.** 205; his Lectures on Romanism, 211; his ceremonial, *ib.*; wrote in *Tracts for the Times*, **i.** 403; letters by, in the *Record*, 418; acknowledges Tract X.C., 429; secedes to Rome, **ii.** 12
- Newton* (*George*), **ii.** 396
- Newton* (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 489
- Newton* (*Rev. John*), **i.** 130, 225, 278, 285; Cowper's connexion with, 143; heard by T. Scott, 179; his ministry received by J. W. Cunningham, 285, **ii.** 172
- Nightingale* (—), **ii.** 472
- Nixon* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 155
- Noel* (*Hon. and Rev. Baptist W.*), 336, 448; secession of, 508
- Non-communicants* at celebrations, presence of, discussed, **ii.** 185
- Nonconforming clergy*, more than 1,500 in time of James I. **i.** 75
- Nonjurors*, secession of, **i.** 397
- Nonsense* of Mr. Macgregor, **ii.** 202; of H. Venn the younger, 294
- Norris* (*Canon*) invites Mr. Randall to preach in his church, **ii.** 457
- North* (*Bishop Brownlow*), **i.** 279, **ii.** 172
- North* (*Lord*), **i.** 243
- Northcote* (*Sir Stafford, Bart.*), **ii.** 307
- Nouell* (*Dean*), **i.** 24

OCK

- OCKHAM* served by Mr. Cunningham, **ii.** 172
Offertory, improper manner of collecting, **ii.** 190
Ogden (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 155
Ogilvie (*Rev. Dr.*), **i.** 460
Oglethorpe (*General*), **i.** 243
Olave (*St.*), *Jewry*, **ii.** 445
 "Old Bob Ridley," **ii.** 391
Old Newton, *Rev. C. Bridges* vicar of, **ii.** 283
Oldcastle (*Sir John*), called "martyr," **i.** 75
Oldknow (*Rev. Dr.*), **ii.** 218, 461
Oliver (*Rev. C. N.*), **ii.** 394
Ollivant (*Bishop*), **i.** 516; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, **ii.** 155; opposes Bishop Tait's Erastianism, 169
Olney, J. Newton curate of, **i.** 136; Cowper at, 143; T. Scott curate of, 184; his account of the people, 185
Olney Hymns, **i.** 261; some by Cowper, more by Newton, 142
Ommaney (*Rev. G. C.*), **ii.** 482; charges against, 483
Opposition to Mr. Romaine, **i.** 105; to Mr. Robinson, 156
Orange faction at Liverpool, **ii.** 478
Oranmore and Browne (*Lord*), **ii.** 369; rebukes the *Rock* for libel, 404
Oratorios condemned by some Low-Churchmen, **i.** 376
Ordination of priests, form of, disliked by T. Scott, **ii.** 90
Organisation of Low-Church party, **i.** 265; improved by Missionary Societies, 295
Ormiston (*Rev. James*) insults Mr. Mackonochie in his church, **ii.** 230; breaks his word at a lecture, 496 (note)
Ornaments' Rubric, how interpreted by Privy Council at first, **ii.** 103
Osborne (*Rev. Lord S. G.*), **ii.** 242
Overton (*Rev. —*), **i.** 304
Owen (*Rev. H. J.*), **i.** 335

PAU

- "Owned," cant term, **i.** 369
Oxenden (*Bishop*), **ii.** 482
Oxford, Protestant teaching at, **i.** 73
Oxford Diocese, "dangerous state of," **ii.** 87

PALEY (*Archdeacon*) quoted, **i.** 101
Palm, communicating in the, **ii.** 282
Palmer (*Captain*), **ii.** 426
Palmer (*Rev. W.*), **i.** 403
Palmerston (*Lord*) speaks of infants as good, **ii.** 77; his ecclesiastical appointments, 73, 77
Pan-Anglican Conference, **ii.** 246
Papal Aggression, **ii.** 12
Parke (*Mr. Baron*), **ii.** 5
Parker (*Archbishop*), **i.** 46; his "Advertisements," **ii.** 325
Parker Society, **i.** 447
Parkhurst (*Bishop*) employs Foxe in preaching, **i.** 67; deems Zurich a perfect pattern of a church, 73
Parnell (*Rev. C.*) memorialised against, **ii.** 282; prosecution of him fails, 352
Parry (*Rev. —*), **ii.** 394
Party-conceit, **i.** 364; **ii.** 231, 497
Party-spirit, **i.** 364
Pascal, **i.** 243
Pastoral letter (*episcopal*), **ii.** 21
Pastoral training, Low-Church inaptitude for, **i.** 374
Patriarchs, regeneration of, **i.** 384
Patteson (*Sir John*), **ii.** 52
Pattison (*Rev. M.*), **ii.** 141
Patton (*Archdeacon*), **ii.** 247
Paul's (*St.*) *Cathedral*, Laud's attempt to restore **i.** 500; decoration of, **ii.** 297
Paul's (*St.*) *Chapel*, Aberdeen, **i.** 495
Paul's (*St.*) *College*, Cheltenham, **i.** 486, **ii.** 12

PAU

- Paul's (St.), Knightsbridge*, complaints about ornaments in, **ii.** 34; Privy Council decision thereon, **i.** 50
- Peache (Rev. A. and Miss)*, founders of London College of Divinity, **ii.** 174
- Peacock (Sir Barnes)*, **ii.** 384
- Peake (Rev. —)*, **ii.** 337
- Pearson (Joseph)*, **ii.** 395
- Peasantry* in 18th century, character of, **i.** 99
- Peckwell (Rev. —)*, **i.** 139
- Peel (Sir R.)* promotes Dr. Gilbert, **i.** 456; and Dr. Ollivant, 460
- Pelham (Bishop J. T.)*, **ii.** 74; invites clergy to meet Dissenters, 75
- Penzance (Lord)*, **ii.** 308; hears the Ridsdale Case, 323; appealed against, 324; condemns Mr. Edwards, 372; more pronouncements of his, 373, 379; in the Mackonochie Case, 377, 378, 382; attacks Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, 380; hears appeal of Bishop Mackarness and Canon Carter, 408; pronounces evidence "unquestioned and unquestionable," 420; inhibits Mr. Green. *ib.*: private interviews with prosecution, 422; "signifies" Mr. Dale, 440; declares him in contempt, 445; pronounces Mr. Enraght's offences "very clearly proved," 466; inhibits Mr. Enraght, 470; complains of the irregularity of three prosecutions, *ib.*; "signifies" Mr. Enraght, 471
- Perceval (Hon. and Rev. A. P.)*, **i.** 403, 404
- Percy (Bishop)*, his *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, **i.** 399
- Percy (Earl)*, **ii.** 307
- Perjury* of a jury, **ii.** 347
- Perkins (J.)*, **ii.** 459, 460, 462; receives Holy Communion, 467; tries to get Mr. Elwin inhibited, 472

PHI

- Perowne (Rev. J. J. S.)*, **ii.** 129
- Perry (Bishop)*, **ii.** 31
- Perry (Dr.)*, **i.** 243
- Persecution* by Queen Mary, how got up, **i.** 65; of Ritualists by Low-Churchmen, reasons of, **ii.** 316
- Perseverance (final)*, T. Scott's sermon on, **i.** 188
- Persons*, preference of, to principles, **ii.** 512
- Peter Martyr* taught Zuinglian-ism, **i.** 10; Grindal's friendship with, 55
- Peter's (St.), Clerkenwell*, **ii.** 288
- Peter's (St.), Colchester*, Mr. Marsh vicar of, **ii.** 177
- Peter's (St.), London Docks*, **ii.** 387
- Peterson (E. W. I.)*, **ii.** 407
- Petition*, antisacramental, to the Queen, **ii.** 33; of Protestants in Salisbury Diocese to Parliament, 243; anticonfessional, to the Queen, 366
- Pew (high)*, anecdote about, **i.** 370
- Phelips (Rev. R. C.)*, **ii.** 47
- Philip (King) of Spain*, **i.** 65
- Philip's (St.), Clerkenwell*, **ii.** 112
- Phillimore (Dr.)*, **ii.** 73; (*Sir Robert*) hears Martin *v.* Mackonochie, **ii.** 239; Flammank *v.* Simpson, 250; Martin's second suit against Mr. Mackonochie, 309; justifies Mr. Cook for refusing Mr. Jenkins Communion, 314; hears Mr. Ridsdale's appeal, 324
- Philpot (Archdeacon)*, **i.** 45
- Philpott (Bishop H.)*, **ii.** 74; sympathises with Bishop Colenso, 75; and with his party, 171; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155; applied to for a new Bishop of Natal, 170; his action towards Mr. Enraght, 461; tries to make Lord Penzance lenient, 472; refuses to inhibit Mr. Elwin, *ib.*

PHI

- Philpotts (Bishop)*, anecdote about, **i.** 378; recommends obedience to rubrics, 468; his conduct towards Mr. Gorham, **ii.** 2; his letter to Archbishop Sumner, 7; holds Exeter Synod, *ib.*; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155
- Pilkington (Bishop)*, **i.** 53
- Pink (Rev. S. H.)*, **ii.** 451
- Pitman (Rev. Dr.)*, **i.** 111
- Pitt (Rt. Hon. W.)*, **i.** 221, 238
- Pius IX. (Pope)*, **i.** 13
- Plays* condemned by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 376
- Plot* for comprehension of Dissenters, **ii.** 31
- Plymouth*, failure to form a "Church Association" branch at, **ii.** 476
- Plymouth Brethren*, 339; opinions of, less dangerous than "Irvingism" or Tractarianism, **ii.** 510
- Pole (Rev. Reginald)*, **ii.** 47
- Polemics*, early Low-Church, **i.** 394
- "*Police News*," **ii.** 403
- Policy (ecclesiastical)* of English rulers, **i.** 396
- "*Policy, not Law*," **ii.** 326
- Pollock (Mr. Baron)*, **ii.** 407
- Pollock (Rev. J. B.)*, **ii.** 218
- Pond*, paid spy, **ii.** 256
- Poole (Rev. A.)*, **ii.** 69; his licence revoked, 70
- Pope*, "*Dying Christian to his Soul*," **i.** 249
- Popery*, unreasoning hatred of, **i.** 472; Low-Church name for Ritualism, **ii.** 214
- Porteus (Bishop)*, **i.** 230, 243
- Portman (Lord)*, **ii.** 243
- Port-Glasgow*, spiritual manifestations at, **i.** 316
- Post-office* authorities, tampering with, **ii.** 200
- Pott (Rev. A.)*, **ii.** 85
- Potter (Rev. Dr.)*, his speech about Mr. Dale, **ii.** 443
- Powell (Mr. Baden)*, **ii.** 133
- Powell (Rev. H.)*, **ii.** 451

PRE

- Powis (Bishop)*, **ii.** 155
- Poynt (Bishop)*, **i.** 23
- "*Practical Picty*," by H. More, **i.** 280
- "*Practical View of Christianity*," by Wilberforce, **i.** 230; its effects on L. Richmond, 297
- Practice (Christian)*, Low-Church views of, **i.** 252
- Pratt (Rev. Josiah)*, **i.** 287
- Prayer (common)* depreciated, **i.** 382; inculcated in *Tracts for the Times*, 405
- Prayer-book*, see *Book of Common Prayer*
- Prayer-book (King Edward's First)* **i.** 8; some provisions of, 12
- Prayer-book (King Edward's Second)*, **i.** 11; some provisions of, 15
- Prayer-book (Queen Elizabeth's revision)*, **i.** 55
- Prayer-book Revision Society*, **ii.** 31; objects of, 93
- Prayer-meetings* of Mr. Drummond, **i.** 493; deemed necessary to the Church's life, 496
- "*Prayers*" (*Mattins and Evensong*) in 18th century, **i.** 89; absence from, by preachers, **ii.** 185
- Preaching* unduly exalted, **i.** 381; bad, 383; in 18th century, 93; (Low-Church) characteristics of, **i.** 258; of Legh Richmond, 302; decline of its efficiency, **ii.** 498
- Preachings (popular)* at Exeter Hall, **ii.** 55; in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, 56
- Presbyterianism* of Bp. Pilkington, **i.** 53; Legh Richmond's agreement with, 305
- Presbyterian* orders allowed in the case of Whittingham, **i.** 13; allowed by Abp. Grindal, 57
- Presbyterians*, fraternising with, of Simeon, **i.** 212; of Bp. Ryle, **ii.** 448
- Prest (Archdeacon)*, **ii.** 213

PRE

Prestbury Church invaded by mob, **i.** 375, 437
Prestige (Low-Church), decline of, **ii.** 499
Preston (Lord), **i.** 110
Pretyman (Bishop), **i.** 202
 " *Priest in Absolution (The)*," **ii.** 198-9, 356; attacked by Lord Redesdale, 361
 " *Priest's Prayer-book (The)*," **i.** 362
Principles, preference of persons to, **ii.** 512
Privy Council (Judicial Committee of), judgment by, in the Gorham Case, **ii.** 5; in Archd. Denison's appeal, 19; on *Essays and Reviews*, 150; in Bp. Colenso's appeal, 162; in the Mackonochie Case, 253, 255; in the Purchas Case, 269, 272; in *Jenkins v. Cook*, 314; in the Ridsdale Case, 324; in the Mackonochie Case again, 379, 384
Proby (Rev. J. C.) on Liturgical Revision, **i.** 391, **ii.** 94
Probyn (Archdeacon), **i.** 310
Procession, Bp. Ryle walking in, **ii.** 481
Promise (breach of), by Bp. Baring, **ii.** 297; by Mr. Ormiston, 496 (note)
Promotion of Low-Church clergymen, **i.** 290, 310
Prophecy (unfulfilled), discussions about, **i.** 309
Protestant Association (Manchester and Salford), **ii.** 183
Protestant communities (foreign), **i.** 4
Protestant Institute (Islington), **ii.** 517
Protestantism intellectual rather than religious, **i.** 3; its destructive character, 14; its arguments discussed in *Tracts for the Times*, 406
Protestant League, **ii.** 337, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349
Protestant Reformation Society, **ii.** 369
Psalms in the 18th century,

REA

i. 90; after Second Lesson ordered by R. Cecil, 174
Public Worship Regulation Act, its origin and Parliamentary history, **ii.** 303; its provisions, 307; its spirit, 315
Pugh (Rev. —), **i.** 172
Pullen (Rev. H. W.), **ii.** 312
Purchas (Rev. J.), buys St. James's Chapel, Brighton, **ii.** 262; prosecuted 263; his petition for rehearing refused, 272; costs in his case, 273; his decease, *ib.*
Puritan, title refused by *Christian Observer*, **i.** 447
Puritanism, its rule in England, **i.** 397; continuance of, in the Church of England, 84
Puritan statistics, **i.** 75
Pusey (Rev. Dr.) on Baptism, **i.** 403; on Fasting, 403, 404; other tracts, 403; his lectures on types and prophecies, **ii.** 211; suspended, **i.** 460; believed to be the founder of St. Saviour's, Leeds, 483
 " *QUAKERS' meeting breakfast*," **i.** 346
RACES condemned by Low-Churchmen, **i.** 376
Radley, Mr. Dallas curate of, **ii.** 284
Raffles (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 489
Randall (Archdeacon), **ii.** 73, 412
Randall (Rev. E.), **ii.** 80
Randall (Rev. R. W.) complained against, **ii.** 80; refused Bristol Cathedral pulpit, 457
Raphael's (St.), Bristol, **ii.** 409
Ravenstone, T. Scott curate of, **i.** 181
Reading, Mr. Cadogan vicar of St. Giles's, **i.** 169
 " *Real Presence*," how understood by Cranmer, **i.** 18; by Bp. Hooper, 38; by T. Robinson, 164; doctrine of, taught in Prayer-book, 85; denied by Bradford, 33; maintained by

REC

- Archd. Denison, **ii.** 45; by Mr. Bennett, 277
- "*Record*" newspaper, **i.** 313; its diminished circulation, **ii.** 205; abuses the S.P.C.K., 372; disapproves sale of Mr. Green's goods, 427; and of Mr. Dale's imprisonment, 441
- Redhead* (*Rev. G. E.*), **ii.** 400
- Reformation in England distinguished from Zuinglianism, **i.** 7; how effected, 396
- Reformation of Manners (*Society for*), **i.** 229
- Reform Bill, **i.** 402
- "*Regeneration*," how understood by T. Robinson, **i.** 161; by T. Scott, 195; by Dean Milner, 203; by Simeon, 215, 217; by Wilberforce, 240; by Bp. Danl. Wilson, 292; baptismal, "the tap-root of Popery," **i.** 313
- Religion in London in Newton's time, **i.** 138; in Leicester at Robinson's coming, 157
- Religious Tract Society*, L. Richmond secretary of, **i.** 303; suppresses passages from the Reformers, 447
- Repentance needed by Church of England for conduct to Puritans, **i.** 523
- Reserve in religious teaching, **i.** 409
- Restoration of King Charles II., **i.** 81; of churches, Rev. F. Close's views upon, **i.** 499
- Revision of Prayer-book proposed in 1844, **i.** 474; desired at Alphington, *ib.*; movement for, **ii.** 89; memorial against, 99; Lord Ebury's Bill for, 428; see also *Prayer-book Revision Society*
- "*Revival*" (*emotional*), **ii.** 78
- Reynolds (*Sir Joshua*), **i.** 240
- Richmond (*Rev. L.*), **i.** 296; on doctrine of justification, 363
- Richmond and Gordon (*Duke of*), **ii.** 324
- Ridding (*Alex.*), **ii.** 400
- Ridley (*Bishop*), his opinions, **i.** 30

RUB

- Ridley Hall, Cambridge, **ii.** 386
- Ridsdale (*Rev. C. J.*), Abp. Tait's attempts against, **ii.** 319; prosecuted by the "Church Association," *ib.*; charges against, 321
- Riland (*Rev. J.*), **ii.** 92
- Riots at St. George's-in-the-East, **ii.** 105, &c.; at St. James's Hatcham, 334; at St. Jude's, Liverpool, 479
- Ripley, Mr. Cunningham curate of, **ii.** 172
- Ritual, Commission on, **ii.** 232; first report of, 243
- "*Ritualism*," rise of, **ii.** 209
- Ritualists, Bishop Oxenden writes in favour of, **ii.** 482
- Robertson (*Dr.*), Chancellor of Rochester Diocese, **ii.** 348
- Robinson (*Rev. T.*), **i.** 154
- Rochford (*Lord*), **i.** 99
- "*Rock*" newspaper, **ii.** 257; apparently tampered with by Romanists, 258; libellous falsehood in, 197; hoaxed, 259; substitution of, for *Church Times*, 200; prosecution of Mr. Ahier for speaking ill of, 403; nicknames its Low-Church opponents "Neo-Evangelicals," 454; libels Mr. Ben-Oliel, 495
- Rodney (*Lord*), **i.** 243
- Roe (*Dr. H.*), **i.** 325
- Romaine (*Rev. W.*), **i.** 103, 138; on Law and Gospel, read by Grimshawe, 176; his ministry received by Daniel Wilson, 277; by J. W. Cunningham, 285, **ii.** 172; recommends weekly Communion, **i.** 418
- Rose (*Rev. H. J.*) edited the *British Magazine*, **i.** 400; consulted by Tractarian Committee, 403
- Ross (*James*), of Bow, **ii.** 346
- Roughton, prosecutor of Mr. Parnell, **ii.** 352
- Rubric (*the Black*), **i.** 86
- Rubrics, observance of, urged, **ii.** 185; regretted by Archbishop

- RUD
- Summer, 188; disobedience to, 500; Low-Church interpretations of, 511
- Rudd (Bishop)*, i. 75
- Ruffianism* towards Mrs. Green, ii. 426; towards Mr. Molony and family, 477; see also *Mob*
- Russell (Lord John)*, his "Durham Letter," ii. 14
- Ryder (Hon. and Rev. H.)*, i. 290
- Ryle (Rev. J. C.)*, self-assertion of, ii. 204; refuses to attend Manchester Church Congress, 173; Dean of Salisbury, 446; Bishop of Liverpool, *ib.*; his manner of ruling, 447; applied to for a new Bishop of Natal, 170; "Doing the Devil's work," 481; his disingenuous misquotation, 495
- SABBATARIANISM** in King Edward's Catechism, i. 30; of Hooper, 38; of Romaine's father, 103; of Low-Churchmen, 254, 377, ii. 35; of Bickersteth, 36; of Archbishop Sumner, *ib.*; of the *Record*, 37; bad effects of, i. 378; opposed by Mr. Alford, ii. 37
- Sabbath*, Puritan doctrine of, i. 30; Bradford's opinion on, 34
- Sabellianism* in a Low-Church pulpit, i. 384
- Sackville College*, East Grinstead, i. 505
- Sacrament (Confraternity of)*, see *Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament*.
- Sacramental Grace*, doctrines of, i. 2
- Sacrilege* at St. George's-in-the-East, ii. 109, 111; at St. James's, Hatcham, threatened, 335, done, 337, 339, 344, 347
- Sacrilege (the Bordesley)*, ii. 466; approved by the "Church Association," 468
- Sacrilege (the Westminster)*, ii. 466
- "*Saint*," abbreviation of the title, ii. 216
- SCR
- Salvation*, scheme of, to be stated in every sermon, ii. 201
- Sampson (Dean)*, i. 47; made a prebendary by Archbishop Parker, 48; his share in the Geneva Bible, 60; teaches Puritanism at Oxford, 74
- Sancroft (Archbishop)*, referred to by Mr. Bickersteth, i. 523
- Sanders* (—) opposes Mr. Tooth, ii. 332; removes altar-ornaments, 349; upheld by magistrate, 350
- Sandwich (Earl of)*, i. 98
- Sandys (Archbishop)*, i. 49
- Sanford (Mr.)*, charges Archdeacon Denison with unfitness, ii. 17
- Sankey (Mr.)*, ii. 451
- Sansam (G. J. B.)*, ii. 395
- Saviour's (St.)*, *Lceeds*, difficulties about, i. 483
- Savoy Conference*, i. 5
- Sawyer (Mr.)*, ii. 73
- Scholfield (Professor)*, opposes Tractarianism, i. 420; member of the Parker Society's Council, 447; urges conformity to rubrics, 186
- Schools* of St. James's, Hatcham, invaded by roughs, ii. 34, 350
- Scobell (Miss)*, funeral of, mobbed, ii. 50
- Scott (Rev. Thomas)*, i. 176, 277; a Socinian when ordained, 94; disliked the baptismal service, 89; the form of ordaining priests, *ib.*; and the Athanasian Creed, 90
- Scott (Rev. J.)*, i. 291
- Scott (Sir Walter)*, tendency of his works, i. 399
- Scottish Episcopal Church*, origin of, i. 490; its Eucharistic office, 491; absurd claims of *Christian Observer* against it, 497
- Scougal's "Life of God in the Soul of Man,"* i. 133
- Scripture*, perversion of, by Mr. Ormiston, ii. 231

SCR

- "*Scripture Characters*," by T. Robinson, **i.** 160, 168
 "Seal," cant term, **i.** 369
Secession of Calvinists, **i.** 292; of Mr. Newman, 431; and others, **ii.** 12; of four Leeds clergymen, **ii.** 18; of the Rev. R. W. Dibdin, 282; of the Rev. Dr. Gregg, 328; of the Rev. C. Molyneux, 370; of the Rev. C. T. Astley, 371
Selborne (*Lord*), **ii.** 324, 384, 408, 473
Self-assertion by Messrs. Ryle and Waldegrave, **ii.** 204
Selje (*Mr.*), **ii.** 110
Sellon (*Miss*), **ii.** 28
Selwyn (*Bishop*) helps at Bishop Alexander's consecration, **i.** 455; allows proceedings against Mr. Gardner, **ii.** 354; refuses to allow proceedings against Mr. Glover, 355
Sepulchre's (*St.*), *Cambridge*, **i.** 480
Sequestration of Mr. Dale's property, **ii.** 442
 "Serious Call," by Rev. W. Law, **i.** 102, 113, 114, &c.
Services (division of), by Mr. Miller, **ii.** 23
Shaftesbury (*Earl of*), at St. Alban's, Holborn, **i.** 371; President of the Parker Society, 447; member of an "Evangelical Alliance," **ii.** 47; his Act for allowing Exeter Hall preachings, 55; his influence with Lord Palmerston, 73; President of the Church Protestant Defence Society, 81; his opinion of *Essays and Reviews*, 147; presides at a county meeting against Ritualism, 228; his Vestments Bill, *ib.*; fraternises with Dissenters, 245, 450; his action about the Public Worship Regulation Bill, 305; withdraws from S.P.C.K., 372; his views of idolatry, **i.** 6 (note), **ii.** 496
Sharp (*Archbishop*), **i.** 491

SOC

- Sharpe* (*Granville*), **i.** 237
Sheppard (*T. B., Esq.*), **ii.** 279
Shepscombe, Rev. H. Stowell curate of, **ii.** 181
Sherbrooke (*Rev. H. N.*), **ii.** 452
Shipley (*Rev. O.*), **ii.** 277
Short (*Bishop*), **ii.** 155
Side (*A.*), **ii.** 396
Sidwell's (*St.*), Exeter, rioting in, **i.** 470
Sierra Leone, **i.** 238; Company of, 239
Silver (*Rev. Samuel*), **i.** 265
Simeon (*Rev. C.*), **i.** 123, 209, 285; his conversion, 246; his non-Sabbatarianism, 255; helps to originate the "Church Missionary Society," 267; his views on spiritual manifestations, 338; his rule for reciting the prayers, 351; his jubilee, 354; his ministry received by J. W. Cunningham, 285, **ii.** 172, and by H. Venn, the younger, 290; presents Mr. Close to the vicarage of Cheltenham, **i.** 499; and Mr. Marsh to that of St. Peter's, Colchester, 177
Simmons (*Rev. —*), **i.** 157
Simpkinson (*Rev. J. N.*), **ii.** 94
Simpson (*Rev. T. B.*), **ii.** 249
Singleton (*H.*), **ii.** 400
Smith (*—*), an early Sabbatarian, **i.** 254
Smith (*Bishop Miles*), **ii.** 51
Smith (*Sir Montague*), **ii.** 324
Smith (*Rev. —*), a Dissenting preacher in America, **i.** 132
Smith (*Mr. Vance*), **ii.** 124
Smith (*Rev. Sydney*), author of the term "Clapham Sect," **i.** 236
Smythe (*Lord Chief Baron*), **i.** 122
Societies (*religious*) formed by S. Walker, **i.** 149; at Leicester, 157
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, **i.** 291; memorialised, 442
 "Society for the Maintenance

SOC

- of *Scriptural Principles*," **i.** 458
- Society (Irish)*, **i.** 513
- Society for Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics*, **i.** 513
- Socinianism* in the Church of England, **i.** 79
- Sophistry* of H. Venn the younger about Baptism, **ii.** 293
- South (Rev. Dr.)*, **i.** 243
- Sparke (Bishop)*, **ii.** 180, 290
- Spencer (Bishop G. T.)*, **ii.** 44
- Spencer (Lord)*, **ii.** 384
- Spies* sent to St. Alban's, Holborn, **ii.** 254, 384; reception of, at St. Peter's, London Docks, 390
- Spitalfields (Christ Church)*, R. Cecil lecturer at, **i.** 173
- Spurgeon (Rev. C. H.)*, his popularity and work, **ii.** 54; saying of Bishop Philpotts about him, **i.** 378
- Spurrell (Rev. James)*, **ii.** 28
- Stanley (Dean)*, **ii.** 124
- Stanley (H. M.)*, **ii.** 197
- Stations of the Cross*, **ii.** 322
- Statues* at Bristol Cathedral, **ii.** 331
- Stephen (James)*, **i.** 237
- Stephen (Sir James)*, referred to, **i.** 128, 356, 358
- Stephens (Dr. Archibald)*, **ii.** 266, 378, 408
- Stephenson (Captain, R.N.)*, **ii.** 311
- Steps to Heaven*, three (anecdote), **i.** 372
- Sterne (Rev. L.)*, **i.** 95, 97
- Stewart (Rev. J. Haldane)*, **i.** 171, 307
- Stoke. T. Scott* curate of, **i.** 178
- Stowell (Rev. Hugh, junior)*, his *Tractarianism Tested*, **i.** 432; his nonsense about church-restoration, 481; his views on Baptism, **ii.** 11; hissed at Church Congress, 174; biographical notice of him, 180
- Stowell (Rev. Hugh, senior)*, **ii.** 180

SYN

- Stupidity* of Low-Churchmen, **i.** 5, 387
- Subjectivity* of Low-Church system, **i.** 233; of H. More's *Practical Piety*, 282; of Cowper's religion, 144
- Subscription (clerical)*, **i.** 418; terms of, how understood by T. Scott, 183; remarks on, **ii.** 97; altered by Parliament, 99
- Suckling (Rev. R.)*, **ii.** 487
- Suicide*, prevention of (anecdote), **ii.** 292
- Sunmer (Bishop C. R.)*, **i.** 310; charges against Tractarianism, 429; refuses to license a curate for Hursley, 431; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, **ii.** 154; would inhibit Bishop Colenso, 155; prosecutes Mr. Wix, 274
- Sunmer (Bishop J. B.)*, **i.** 290; consecrates Christ Church, Salford, **ii.** 183; (*Archbishop*) **i.** 508; criticises the *Record*, 313; his treatise on Apostolical Preaching, 400; hears the Gorham Appeal, **ii.** 5; hears Archdeacon Denison's case, 48; hears the case of the Knightsbridge churches, 52; upholds Dean Alford's communion at Berlin, 62; confirms Bishop Tait's revocation of Mr. Poole's licence, 70; approves of H. Venn's plot for mutilating the Prayer-book, 91; his Sabbatarianism, 36
- Sunday*, manner of its observance in 18th century, **i.** 100
- Surplice* refused at Trinity and St. John's, Cambridge, **i.** 74
- Surplice-riots*, **i.** 469, 512
- Surrey Chapel*, **ii.** 245
- Surrey (Earl of)*, **i.** 66
- Sutherland (Duke of)*, **ii.** 368
- Swift (Dean)*, **i.** 97
- Symbolism*, **ii.** 275; Protestant hostility to, **i.** 475, 482
- Symons (Rev. Dr.)*, **i.** 460
- Synod of Exeter*, **ii.** 7; Low-Church policy about, 20

TAB

- "*TABERNACLE*" (Whitfield's), **i.** 139
- "*Tainted*," cant term, **i.** 369
- Tait* (Rev. A.C.), **i.** 427; (*Bishop*) **ii.** 70; revokes Mr. Poole's licence, *ib.*; licenses Mr. Allen at St. George's-in-the-East, 105; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 154; refuses to inhibit Bishop Colenso, 155; his sermon at All Saints', Margaret St., 215; his resolution to exterminate Puseyites, 238; allows Mr. Mackonochie's prosecution, 239; (*Archbishop*), 250; introduces Public Worship Regulation Bill, 304; his attempts against Mr. Ridsdale, 319; hears Mr. Ridsdale's appeal, 324; dispenses him from obligation to use vestments, &c., 326; thanks Lord Redesdale for attacking *The Priest in Absolution*, 363; invites High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen to discuss union, 371; vetoes proceedings against Mr. Lowder, 392; advocates deprivation of a Ritualist, 432; supports "Church-Association" Bill for this, 433; consumes the profaned Eucharist, 469; his decease, 485; last letter to Mr. Mackonochie, 486
- Talbot* (Mr. J. G.), opposes the Public Worship Regulation Bill, **ii.** 307; supports the Deprivation Bill, 433
- Talbot* (Mr., of Kineton), **i.** 152
- Talbot* (Mrs.), **i.** 210
- "*Tale of a Tub*," **i.** 97
- Tayler* (Rev. C. B.), quoted, **i.** 370
- Taylor*, perpetrator of the Bordesley Sacrilege, **ii.** 467; tries to get Mr. Elwin inhibited, 472
- Taylor* (*Bishop Jeremy*), **i.** 243, **ii.** 362
- Taylor* (Mr. Wilbraham), **ii.** 47
- Tebbs* (Messrs.), **ii.** 424

THO

- Teignmouth* (Lord), **i.** 236
- Temple* (Earl), **i.** 98
- Temple* (Rev. Dr.), **ii.** 130; (*Bishop*), applied to for a new Bishop of Natal, 170; appointed by the Queen to act in Mr. Dale's Case, 416
- Templer* (Rev. W. C.), **ii.** 240
- Tennyson* (Lord), *Northern Farmer*, **ii.** 427
- Terrick* (*Bishop*), **i.** 105
- Terot* (*Bishop*), **i.** 493
- Thanksgiving* (*General*), repetition of, by congregation, **ii.** 191, 512
- Theological Colleges*, **ii.** 84
- Thesiger* (Lord Justice), **ii.** 382, 407
- Thesiger* (Sir Frederick, afterwards Lord Chelmsford), **ii.** 269
- Thirlwall* (*Bishop*), **ii.** 123; attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 155; refuses to inhibit Bishop Colenso, 156
- Thomas's* (St.), Birmingham, W. Marsh incumbent of, **ii.** 178
- Thomason* (Rev. Thomas), **i.** 218
- Thompson* (Dr.), **i.** 325
- Thomson*, W. (*Bishop*), **ii.** 74; sympathises with Bishop Colenso, 75; (*Archbishop*), attends meeting of bishops about Bishop Colenso, 154; refuses to inhibit Bishop Colenso, 156; refuses Bishop Gray's announcement of Bishop Macrorie's consecration, 169; refuses to attend Pan-Anglican Conference, 248; hears appeal in Mackonochie Case, 253; in Purchas Case, 269; hears Mr. Purchas's petition for rehearing, 272; calls the Bennett Judgment a miscarriage of justice, 282; his action about the Public Worship Regulation Bill, 305; hears another appeal in the Mackonochie Case, 384; supports Bill for depriving

THO

- Ritualists, 433; refuses to entertain charges against Mr. Ommaney, 484
- Thornton Church*, served by R. Cecil, **i.** 172
- Thornton (Henry)*, **i.** 236, 237, 285
- Thornton (John)*, **i.** 237; presents Newton to St. Mary Woolmoth, 138
- Thornton (William)*, **ii.** 400
- Thorold (Bishop)*, **ii.** 396, 398
- Thorpe (Rev. R. O. T.)*, **ii.** 398
- Threatening* of Mr. Abbott, **ii.** 218; of Mr. Gardner, 353
- "*Three-deckers*," **i.** 88
- Thurlow (Lord Chancellor)*, **i.** 99
- Tillotson (Archbishop)*, **ii.** 123
- "*Times (The)*," its unreasoning Protestantism, **i.** 472
- Toleration Act*, **i.** 402
- Tongues (unknown)* uttered by George and James Macdonald, **i.** 320; by others, 322, &c.
- Tooth (Rev. A.)*, **ii.** 331; prosecuted, 332; disregards Lord Penzance's Monition, 333; imprisoned, 336; released, *ib.*; his proceedings on returning from abroad, 338; proceedings against him quashed, 346; resigns his living, 348
- Tottenham Court Chapel*, **i.** 139
- Towers (R. F.)*, **ii.** 395
- Tract XC.*, **i.** 415
- Tractarian Committee*, **i.** 403
- Tractarianism*, first rise of, 402; more dangerous than Plymouthism, **ii.** 510
- "*Tracts for the Times*," **i.** 403
- Training Colleges* at Cheltenham, **i.** 486
- Transubstantiation*, doctrine of, **i.** 4; history of, in *Tracts for the Times*, 405
- Trinity Chapel, Edinburgh*, **i.** 493
- Trinity Church, Cambridge*, **i.** 210
- Trinity Church, Huddersfield*, **ii.** 182
- "*Tristram Shandy*," **i.** 97; quoted, 95

VIS

- Tritton (Rev. R. B.)*, **ii.** 401
- Truro*, Samuel Walker curate of, **i.** 145
- Trusts*, misappropriation of, **ii.** 443
- Tupper (Martin)*, **ii.** 492
- Turkish Missions Aid Society*, **ii.** 62
- Turner* at head of roughs at St. James's, Hatcham, **ii.** 349
- Turner (Bishop)*, **i.** 345
- Tyndale (William)*, works of, **i.** 8
- UNCHARITABLENESS*, **i.** 387
- Uniformity (Act of)*, **i.** 82
- Unreality* in Low-Church system, **i.** 373
- Usher (Archbishop)*, "*Answer to a Jesuit*," **i.** 408
- VATCHER (Rev. J. S. A.)*, **ii.** 355
- Venn (Rev. H., the elder)*, **i.** 210, 351; respect shown for, 97; biographical notice of, 110; disliked the Baptismal Service, **ii.** 89
- Venn (Rev. H., the younger)*, his account of the Gorham Appeal Judgment, **ii.** 6; plot of, for mutilating the Prayer-book, 91; line taken by him about *Essays and Reviews*, 151; biographical notice of, 289
- Venn (Rev. J.)*, **i.** 210, 236, 240, 241, 266, 268
- "*Verbal Inspiration*," **i.** 64
- "*Verts to Rome*," **ii.** 12
- Vessels (special)* for private communion disliked, **ii.** 188
- Vestments*, Lord Shaftesbury's Bill for regulating, **ii.** 228
- Vestry-meeting* at Gateshead, **ii.** 217
- Vianney (M., Curé of Ars)*, **ii.** 196
- Villicers (Bishop Montagu)*, **ii.** 74; nepotism of, 75
- Visitation of sick* in 18th century, **i.** 96; neglected by Low-Churchmen, 505, **ii.** 200
- Visiting* on Sunday by Wilberforce, **i.** 277

VOL

Voluntary on organ after
Psalms, **i.** 174

WAGNER (*Rev. A. D.*), **ii.** 26

Waipapu bishopric founded by
"Church Missionary Society,"
ii. 58

Wainwright (*Rev. L. S.*), **ii.** 490

Wainwright (*Rev. S.*), inflam-
matory lectures of, **ii.** 459;
speech of, 476

Wake (*Archbishop*), **i.** 88

Wakes, **i.** 352

Waldegrave (*Hon. and Rev. S.*),
self-assertion of, **ii.** 204 (note
†); (*Bishop*) 74; attends
meeting of bishops about
Bishop Colenso, 155

Walker (*Rev. H. A.*), **ii.** 349

Walker (*Rev. Saml.*), **i.** 102, 144

Walpole (*Horace*), **i.** 243

Warbreck (*Rev. E.*), **ii.** 451

Warburton (*Bishop*), **i.** 243; his
Divine Legislation of Moses
controversy by Romaine, 104

Ward (*Rev. A. H.*), **ii.** 408

Warrell (*Wm.*), **ii.** 418

Watson (*Lord*), **ii.** 384

Watts (*Rev. A. H.*) intruder at
Holy Trinity, Bordesley, **ii.**
474

Webb (*Churchwarden*), **ii.** 338,
341; Mr. Tooth's letter to
him, 338

Wells Theological College, **ii.** 84

Wensleydale (*Lord*), **ii.** 52

Wesley (*Rev. Chas.*), **i.** 101

Wesley (*Rev. John*), **i.** 102; his
chapel in London, 139; his
preachers, *ib.*

Wesleyan Missions supported
by Dean Milner, **i.** 204, 271

West (*Rev. R. T.*), complained
against, **ii.** 69; publicly ex-
onerated, 73

Westbury (*Lord*), **ii.** 253, 272

Westerton (*Churchwarden*), his
suit to abolish certain church
ornaments, **ii.** 34, 51; his
complaint to Bishop Blom-
field, 34; Privy Council judg-
ment thereon, 52

WIL

Westminster Sacrilege, **ii.** 466

Weston Underwood, T. Scott
curate of, **i.** 178

West Worlington, ruffianism at,
ii. 477

Wetheral (*Major*), **ii.** 363

Weymouth (*Lord*), **i.** 99

Whately (*Archbishop*), his be-
haviour abroad, **ii.** 118; his
mode of consecrating a church,
ib.

Wheler Chapel, Spitalfields, **i.**
290, 518

Whitfield (*Rev. G.*), **i.** 101, 102;
Newton makes his acquaint-
ance, 135; possible relations
of Cowper with, 143; admired
by Wilberforce's mother, 220

Whitgift (*Archbishop*), **i.** 58;
suspends about 233 clergy-
men, 75

Whittingham (*Dean*), **i.** 13; at
Frankfort, 67; his share in
the Geneva Bible, 60

"Whole Duty of Man," **i.** 121

Wickford, T. Robinson curate
of, **i.** 156

Wickliffe, see *Wycliffe*

Wightman (*Mr. Justice*), **ii.**
83

Wightwick (—), **ii.** 320

Wigram (*Bishop*), **ii.** 74; in-
veighs against clerical beards,
&c., 75; attends meeting of
bishops about Bishop Colenso,
155; had inhibited Bishop
Colenso, 156

Wilberforce (*Bishop Saml.*),
criticises the *Record*, **i.** 313;
exonerates Mr. West., **ii.** 73;
his church principles, 83;
attends meeting of bishops
about Bishop Colenso, 154;
his speech at a working-men's
meeting, 287 (note)

Wilberforce (*Wm., M.P.*), **i.** 220,
285; his testimony to T.
Scott, 192

Wilkinson (*Rev. J.*), **ii.** 297

Willett (*Rev. —*), libel against,
ii. 199

Williams (*Dean*), **ii.** 170

Williams (*Rev. Dr. Rowland*),

WIL

- ii.** 131; prosecuted by Bishop Hamilton, 147
- Williams* (Archdeacon Isaac), **i.** 404; candidate for Poetry Professorship, 456
- Wilson* (Bishop Thomas) on the Sacrament, **i.** 209
- Wilson* (Caroline, née Fry) quoted, **i.** 358
- Wilson* (Mr., of Rowshams), **i.** 404
- Wilson* (Rev. Daniel), **i.** 276, 448; (Bishop), 341; his previous work, *ib.*; opposes the "Church Missionary Society," **ii.** 59; his ministry received by H. Venn the younger, 290
- Wilson* (Rev. Daniel, junior) disapproves of Mr. Ormiston's conduct at St. Alban's, **ii.** 231; his invitation to clerical meeting, 513
- Wilson* (Rev. H. B.), **i.** 426; writes in *Essays and Reviews*, **ii.** 136; prosecuted by Mr. Fendall, 148
- Window* (stained) for Calcutta Cathedral, **i.** 476
- Winslow* (Rev. F. E.), **ii.** 449
- Witcham*, T. Robinson curate of, **i.** 156
- Witherspoon* on Regeneration, **i.** 226
- Wix* (Rev. R. H. E.), prosecuted by Bishop Sumner, **ii.** 274
- Wolverhampton*, clergy and churchwardens of, attack Mr. Bodington, **ii.** 396
- Winston*, Rev. A. R. C. Dallas rector of, **ii.** 284
- Wooburn*, Rev. A. R. C. Dallas curate of, **ii.** 284
- Wood* (Edwin), **ii.** 400
- Woodard* (Canon), his school scheme opposed, **ii.** 171
- Woodl* (Rev. Basil), his ministry received by Daniel Wilson, **i.** 277; by J. W. Cunningham, 285, **ii.** 172
- Woodford* (Rev. Dr.) recom-

ZWI

- mends formation of religious societies, **i.** 157
- Woodward* (Rev. —), **ii.** 326
- Woolfrey* (Mary), **i.** 446
- Wordsworth* (William), tendency of his works, **i.** 399
- Working Men's Protestant League*, **ii.** 453
- Works* (Low-Church), **i.** 253
- Worldliness* of Low-Churchmen, **ii.** 194, 452
- Worrill* (J. H.), **ii.** 419
- Wray* (Rev. Cecil) in the Irish fever, **i.** 505; abused, **ii.** 478
- Wright* (Rev. F. H. A.), **ii.** 401
- Wycliffe*, his opinions, **i.** 206
- Wycliffe Hall*, Oxford, **ii.** 385
- Wynn* (Churchwarden), brings charges against Mr. Ommaney, **ii.** 483; interferes with Mr. Ives, 484; invites Dr. Potter to lecture, 485
- Wynter* (Rev. Dr.), **i.** 427, 460; his manner of abbreviating the word *Saint*, **ii.** 216

- YARDLEY*, Rev. A. R. C. Dallas vicar of, **ii.** 284
- Yardley* (Mr.), **ii.** 110
- Yarmouth* (Lord), **ii.** 307
- York* (Bishop), **i.** 209

- ZUINGLIAN* language, ambiguity in, **i.** 19
- Zuinglian* reformers studied by L. Richmond, **i.** 298
- Zuinglianism* taught by Peter Martyr and Bucer, **i.** 10; causes of its popularity in England, 65; generally taught under King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, 73; promoted by rulers, 396; held by Low-Churchmen implicitly, 250
- Zwingli*, his teaching on Sacraments, **i.** 12





